FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 114 13 June 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

U.S. Officials Interviewed on Disarmament AA 1
New U.S. Proposals 'Unacceptable as Before' AA 4
[Pogachev]
USSR 'Does Not Want' More Weapons Than NATO AA 5
[Ponomarev]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Situation: Questions & Answers' CC 1
[Doronin, Bovin, Demchenko, Cobo]
U.S. Policy, Arms Talks CC 1
French Foreign Policy Changes CC 3
Events in Middle East CC 4
Central American Developments CC 7
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 10
[Bovin, Shishlin, Levin]
Soviet-Finnish Talks Viewed CC 10
Nakasone's 'Finnish' Remark CC 11
U.S.-USSR Stands on Disarmament CC 12
French, UK Deployment Interests CC 14
Israeli Policies Viewed CC 15
Difficulties for OAU Session CC 17
NATO Council Session Ends; Communique Scored CC 18
Confirms Deployment CC 18
Instrument of U.S. Strategy CC 18
Communique 'Purest Demogogy' [Levin] CC 19
'Hypocritical Assurances' [PRAVDA 13 Jun] CC 20
NATO Funds Expand U.S. Military in Faroes CC 22
[Voronkov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jun]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Harrimans Answer Questions on Moscow Meetings A 1
PRAVDA Report [7 Jun] A 1
CBS TV Interview A 2
NOVOSTI Observer on Change in Reagan's 'Style' A 2
State Department Report Called 'Propaganda Trick' A 3
Shultz Reflects U.S. 'Militarist Aspirations' A 4

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japan's Anti-Soviet Campaign Criticized C 1
[Andreyev]
IZVESTIYA on U.S. Strategy in Far East C 2
[Nikolayev, 10 Jun]

SOUTH ASIA

Pakistani Foreign Minister Visits Moscow D 1
Yaqub Khan Arrives D 1
Gromyko, Khan Discuss DRA [PRAVDA 12 Jun] D 1
Talks, Lunch Speeches Noted [Karachi] D 2
IZVESTIYA Article Criticizes 'Lies' About DRA D 2
[V. Svetozarov, 9 Jun]
USSR-DRA Radio, Television Agreement Signed D 4
Briefs: DRA Group Departs Uzbekistan D 4

WESTERN EUROPE

Koivisto, Delegation Wrap Up USSR Visit G 1
Cooperation Program Details G 1
[IZVESTIYA 9 Jun]
Patolichev-Laine Meeting [PRAVDA 10 Jun] G 1
Arrives in Kiev G 1
Tours Kiev; Attends Dinner G 2
Leaves Kiev for Home G 3
Joint Communique Released [PRAVDA 11 Jun] G 3
Moscow Observer on UK Election Implications G 8
[Dunayev]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Moscow Condemns Egyptian Minister's Stand H 1
All-Arab People's Congress Opens 9 June H 2
Tudeh Crackdown in Iran Blamed on U.S. H 2

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

USSR Sends Greetings to 19th OAU Session J 1
[PRAVDA 10 Jun]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

PRAVDA Hits U.S. Nicaraguan Policy, Activities [12 Jun] K 1
Mexican Socialist Leader Writes in PRAVDA [28 May] K 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU Central Committee Politburo Session Held R 1
Abrasimov To Head New Tourist Committee R 2
Recalled From GDR R 2
New Envoy Appointed R 2

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

IZVESTIYA Reports USSR Agricultural Activity [2 Jun] T 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Marshal Kulikov on End of Soyuz-83 Exercises V 1

U.S. OFFICIALS INTERVIEWED ON DISARMAMENT

LD121911 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 12 Jun 83

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] Hello, comrades! The fourth round of talks on strategic arms limitations and reduction began last week in Geneva. Unfortunately, the preceding three rounds produced no positive results. I will not now compare the Soviet and U.S. positions. The relevant figures and arguments have on several occasions been indicated in our press.

On the eve of the fourth round the Americans have decided to show flexibility. Noisy publicity is now being given to the new approach of President Reagan. The history of this is as follows: For a long time the White House had been haggling with Congress. The President insisted that Congress should allocate money for the MX missile while Congress insisted that the President should show more common sense at these same talks.

And here is what they agreed upon: Congress allocated $625 million to begin work and the President promised to adopt a more flexible position.

What new things did President Reagan propose? Kenneth Dam, U.S. deputy secretary of state, will now tell us about this. Aleksandr Druzhinin had an interview with Dam, and for technical reasons the first question was not recorded on the tape. I will now read it to you:

Mr Deputy Secretary of State, asked Druzhinin, what will the new U.S. approach be to the problem of limiting and reducing strategic weapons?

[Begin video recording; questions and answers in English with superimposed translation]

[Dam] The United States wants to reduce nuclear weapons and, furthermore, to reduce them substantially. Therefore, we are proposing to the Soviet Union to mutually reduce the number of nuclear warheads to 5,000. Here we are speaking of the number of warheads and not missiles, since certain missiles are armed not with one but with several warheads.

Thus the number of warheads will be reduced by approximately one-third. We also have an interest in maintaining parity in the number of missiles and the number of warheads, as well as parity in throw-weight [vyvodimyy ves], that is, the destructive potential of these types of weapons.

And finally, we consider that the fulfillment of any agreement must be subject to verification. These are our basic proposals.

And now for the statement by President Reagan. He said that since our figures were much lower than the figure proposed by the Soviet Union, we are ready to go to meet the Soviet Union, for we think that the talks should take into consideration the interests of both sides. In our opinion, this will facilitate progress at the talks.

The President also proposed a method for applying indirect pressure, or, in other words, an indirect way of reducing throw-weight. However, if the USSR prefers, as the President stressed, to conduct the talks on the destructive potential of strategic weapons on the plane [v plan] of reducing the throw-weight tonnage, then we are ready for that too.

Those are the basic changes in the U.S. position. They are based on the results of discussion of this problem with members of the U.S. Congress and also on the report by the Scowcroft independent commission.

[Druzhinin] I cannot but ask you the following question. There are quite a few people who are convinced that the United States aspires to conduct talks with the Soviet Union from a position of strength, from a position of military superiority. What can you say about that?

[Answer] It is undoubtedly true that we believe in strength. We think that if the United States is weak, then the Soviet Union will not have the incentive to conduct serious talks, but besides that, no matter what you are talking about, be it strategic weapons or medium-range missiles in Europe, then in all these areas, it is in fact the Soviet Union which has superiority over the United States. And so we do believe in strength, but we are not aspiring to military superiority. The only thing to which we do aspire is parity.

[Question] The conviction exists in the Soviet Union that the program for deploying MX missiles, which the United States is now implementing as well as other programs for building other types of strategic weaponry, does not indicate a sincere desire on the part of the United States to achieve the restraining of the arms race.

[Answer] I would say that both our countries are engaged in upgrading their weapons systems. And we consider that our arms modernization process is proceeding extremely slowly. To be sure, in the 1970's we deployed no new weapons. But the fact that we are ready to build new weaponry in itself is far from an indication of absence on our part of readiness to hold talks about these weapons.

[Question] And what can you say about the U.S. position on the question of freezing nuclear weapons?

[Answer] We do not think that a freeze on nuclear weapons would help resolve the problem of potential instability in the world or eliminate the risk of war.

As I have already said, what we are interested in is substantial reductions in nuclear arsenals. In our opinion, talks on a nuclear freeze would boil down to such questions as stopping tests on nuclear weapons, ways of verifying agreements, etc.

Let us rather hold talks on reducing stocks of nuclear weapons, and after that it may be possible to freeze nuclear weapons at a lower quantitive level.

[Question] As a representative of the U.S. Administration, what could you say about the prospects for the Geneva talks?

[Answer] That question is often asked, but it is not an easy one to answer. I would say that we are neither optimistic nor pessimistic. As the President stated, we are ready to modify our positions so as to reach agreement based on the principles of balance, parity, verification, and mutual benefit.

We consider that if the Soviet Union is also ready to change its position and to hold serious talks, then agreement will become possible. And so we are ready and waiting for corresponding steps in the same direction by the Soviet Union. [end recording]

In just a little while I will return to what Mr Dam has told us. But for the time being, listen to the opinion of another American, retired Rear Admiral Gene La Rocque, director of the Washington Center for Defense Information.

[Begin video recording; questions and answers in English, with superimposed translation]

[La Rocque] The U.S. approach to the problem of limiting and reducing strategic weapons does not have the necessary scope. The U.S. side is now proposing setting a limit on the number of warheads on strategic missiles -- only for missiles. However, if one compares the number of warheads of all types of weaponry in the strategic nuclear arsenals of both the United States and the Soviet Union, then it turns out that overall the United States has more warheads. So I would say that President Reagan is seriously inclined as far as strategic arms control is concerned, but only so far as this concerns control of Soviet weapons, not of U.S. weapons.

In general, if one examines the policy of the current administration in the area of arms control, then it is not hard to note that it shows interest only in control regarding certain highly limited aspects of this problem, and I consider that if the United States really wants serious talks with the USSR, then it should agree that the talks should cover all sorts of nuclear weapons, all systems for delivering such weapons.

[Druzhinin] What can you say about the program for building MX missiles? Is such a program compatible with a sincere desire to establish control over the arms race?

[Answer] Frankly, President Reagan's approach, which links arms control with an increase in the nuclear arms race, is simply laughable. What happens is that the United States favors incompatible things at the same time; it favors both arms control and increases in weaponry. Washington goes so far as to give as a justifying argument that the arms race allegedly promotes disarmament. Is that not a paradox? MX is a very dangerous weapons system. Midgetmen are no less dangerous missiles. There is much talk about them at present in Washington. So it emerges that the more the United States talks about arms control, the more new nuclear weapons systems they aspire to build.

[Question] Using as a basis the numerous statements by high-ranking representatives of the Reagan administration, it is not difficult to reach the following conclusion: The United States considers that talks with the Soviet Union must be conducted from a position of strength, we Americans would view that as blackmail. I am very suspicious of this position, which stems from the premise that increasing weapons would allegedly be a basic condition for reducing them.

[Question] What is your opinion of the USSR proposal on freezing nuclear weapons, a proposal which has been rejected by the U.S. Administration?

[Answer] I am very satisfied with the fact that the Soviet Union supports the idea of a freeze on nuclear weapons. Of course, Soviet-U.S. talks on this issue would not be easy. But still I would like our government also to approve the idea of a nuclear freeze and to try, along with the Soviet Union, to go to the talks table on this issue. I am convinced that, first of all, the creation, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons must be stopped and that they must then be reduced. [end recording]

And there you have, as they say, first-hand information. I think La Rocque has quite accurately defined the weak points in the American approach to the talks. I would just like to add a few thoughts. It is, of course, rather difficult to carry on polemics with Mr Dam, as this judgements are very streamlined, but anyway... He says, for example, that the United States did not deploy any new weapons during the seventies. Wonderful! But it was precisely during that decade that the Americans increased the number of warheads in their strategic arsenal by almost more than twofold. And, you see, the targets are struck not by the missiles themselves, nor by aircraft or submarines, but precisely by warheads. So it's not worth the Americans' while to [word indistinct] here.

On another issue -- the freeze, for example. Here is Mr Dam's logic: If we start talks on freezing, then we'll get mixed up in all kinds of difficulties over control there, let's say, and so on. [as heard] And so let's start by reducing and then freeze. But the point here is that all these difficulties indicated also exist in the talks on arms reduction. That's the first point. Secondly, it's a completely different issue here, because the Americans want to talk of disarmament on the one hand, while building up arms on the other. And so this freeze is of no use to them whatsoever.

And finally, regarding Reagan's new approach proper: The President, as you heard Mr Dam say, went to meet the Soviet Union halfway, for he agreed to a higher ceiling on the number of ballistic missiles than the existing 850. Well, formally this may be true, but in reality the Americans have in fact gone to meet themselves halfway, because they are currently reviewing the issue of the mass production of Midgetmen single-unit missiles [monoblochnaya raketa] and this obviously does not fit within the 850 limit. This is why they needed these free figures.

Let's sum up. The old American proposals were openly aimed at severely reducing the basis of our defense potential: our land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. And it is precisely in this most important respect that Reagan's new approach does not amount to anything new -- absolutely nothing. If one is to believe American sources, in 1976, when Reagan still lived in California and not in the White House, he listed as some of the fundamental freedoms America takes pride in: the freedom to try and to be wrong; and the freedom to make mistakes and to do what others may find stupid. An it seems to me sometimes that certain Americans misuse this freedom. There is no small number of Americans, however, who consider that one may of course make mistakes, but when it's a matter of whether there is to be a war or not, it's better not to make mistakes but to limit the freedom to commit stupidities. Antiwar and anitmilitaristic moods are infecting more and more sections of American society.

NEW U.S. PROPOSALS 'UNACCEPTABLE AS BEFORE'

LD101532 Moscow TASS in English 1357 GMT 10 Jun 83

["On the Same Positions" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS -- TASS military correspondent Vladimir Bogachev writes: The following main conclusion is seen sufficiently clearly in the numerous comments of the world press on U.S. President Reagan's statement as regards talks on limiting and reducing strategic armaments: No substantial changes have taken place in the U.S. position at the talks in Geneva, the U.S. proposals are as unacceptable to the Soviet Union as before.

The kernel of the U.S. proposals remains such a combination of a limit to the aggregate number of warheads on land- and sea-based strategic missiles (5,000 units) with a "ceiling" on warheads on land-based ICBM's (2,500 units), which should force the Soviet Union into radically restructuring its strategic forces and eliminating a huge part of its land-based ICBM's, which now form the backbone of the country's defense potential.

At the same time, in accordance with Reagan's latest proposals the United States would get an opportunity to considerably increase the number of warheads on its ICBM's and to continue to carry out its programs to build up its strategic capability.

As before, Reagan proposes maximum limitations on ICBM's, that is in the field where the USSR has a certain advantage, minimum limitations on submarine-launched ballistic missiles, a field where the United States now has a nearly 3 to 1 superiority in the number of nuclear warheads, and practically no reductions of heavy bombers, in the number of which the United States has a nearly 4 to 1 advantage.

The individual changes as compared with the U.S. proposals of May 9, 1982, only testify to the fact that the U.S. position at the talks is growing tougher.

Firstly, the U.S. President is going to "moderate" the previous U.S. proposal for limiting the number of deployed ballistic missiles to 850 by raising this ceiling. Reagan himself concedes that the U.S. renunciation of the previously proposed limit has been caused by the fact that it could "contain" the development of new U.S. ICBM's.

Secondly, Reagan declared that the United States would propose such limitations which would indirectly make for the lessening of the problem of the missiles' throw-weight. U.S. commentators assess this, Reagan's novel suggestion, as the U.S. striving to insist on substantial reductions of the latest Soviet ICBM's, without touching any U.S. strategic systems.

Another Reagan "novelty" is that his proposals are totally out of line with his promise to raise in Geneva the issue of the obligation to dismantle two old nuclear warheads each time when deploying a new one. It was precisely with the help of that promise, given in writing to many senators and congressmen, that the president succeeded in pushing through Congress appropriations to build new MX ICBM's, each with ten warheads.

The United States has once again put forward proposals concerning the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments, which are patently unacceptable to the Soviet Union. The U.S. proposals are aimed at disrupting the strategic parity, which has taken shape in recent years, in order to clear the way for the United States to gain military superiority.

USSR 'DOES NOT WANT' MORE WEAPONS THAN NATO

LD110618 Moscow TASS in English 0613 GMT 11 Jun 83

["New Terms, Old Goals" -- TASS Headline]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Washington is still unwilling to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms on the basis of equality and justice.

To conceal this unwillingness, first and foremost from the U.S. and West European public, the White House resorts to all sorts of propaganda ploys. It is this purpose that is pursued, in particular, by a report released by the U.S. Department of State which lists Washington's so-called initiatives in "arms control". There is a paradox, however: The more "initiatives" Washington advances, the higher the stockpiles of weaponry accumulated by the United States, including nuclear, neutron and chemical weapons. In addition Washington is now raising a hue and cry over a "new approach" and "greater flexibility" in the U.S. position at the Geneva talks. Washington's old stand, aimed at reaching military superiority, is now characterised as "new" and even "flexible". In reality, all this is nothing more than a substitution of new terms for old ones.

Progress on the substance of the problems could be achieved if the American side approached with proper responsibility the Soviet arguments presented in the statement made by the Soviet Government on May 28. Reiterating the consistency of its approach of principle to the problem of limiting and reducing strategic nuclear weapons, the Soviet side suggests extensive reductions in these weapons in their entirety with a view to enhancing overall military-strategic stability and with strict respect for the principle of equality and equal security. The far-reaching proposals on mutual reductions in strategic carriers and their nuclear warheads made by the Soviet Union in Geneva provide a good basis for accord.

The Soviet Union holds a similarly constructive stand on the problem of reducing medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. The Soviet side suggests that they be reduced in a way leaving it with not more medium-range missiles and warheads on them than Britain and France have. The USSR does not want to have a single medium-range plane or a single air launched nuclear warhead more than the NATO countries would have.

The Reagan administration's efforts, however, are aimed at ensuring superiority over the Soviet Union under any pretext, that is, at tipping the existing rough balance of forces. Naturally, in this case the Soviet Union will face the need to take measures in response to strengthen its own defence capability and to protect its allies, in particular, by deploying adequate strategic systems. Prompt and effective measures will also be taken if American medium-range nuclear missiles begin to be deployed in Western Europe. The Soviet Union cannot remain defenceless at the time when NATO's nuclear missiles are targeted at it.

Particular note should be taken of the fact that the situation is not yet finally deadlocked and that a way out still can and must be found. Given goodwill in the NATO capitals, agreement can still be reached. That is why, proceeding from the actual situation, the Soviet Union suggests that the possible consequences of Washington's course of dangerous nuclear escalation and confrontation to all the parties involved be seriously weighed up again.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD111228 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1215 GMT 10 Jun 83

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program with Anatoliy Andreyevich Doronin, All-Union Radio commentator; Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; Pavel Yepifanovich Demchenko, member of the PRAVDA editorial board; and Juan Juanovich Cobo, deputy editor in chief of LATINSKAYA AMERIKA]

[Excerpt] [Doronin] Hello, esteemed comrades. We are going to deal with a number of the subjects you bring up in your letters. First, a problem that worries everyone today -- the nuclear arms race or, more specifically, certain questions connected with it,because the subject as a whole is a very broad one; then the causes of changes in France's foreign policy -- many of your letters contain bewilderment over certain actions by the French Governmnet; after that we shall talk about the situation in the Near East a year after the start of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon; next about events in Central America; and finally, we will end the program with brief replies to other questions.

U.S. Policy, Arms Talks

Since your letters, comrades, frequently not only contain questions but also express views about what is taking place in the world, I should like to start with some extracts from your letters. Yakov Tikhonovich Makarov, a participant in the war and veteran of labor, from the village of Krivozerye in Penza Oblast, writes: I served during the whole of the Great Patriotic War as a private; I fought my way across half of Europe, and it is a marvel that I survived. The war's end found me in Austria. I know very well what war is, so I completely and totally support the Soviet Government's timely statement in connection with the U.S. plans to delploy new medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe and with the development of the new MX ballistic missiles. Reagan, he writes, should remember that we will not stand idly by but will take reciprocal measures to strengthen our defense capability.

Mr Reagan should come to his senses before it is too late. Those are words taken from a letter from (Yevtaliya) Aleksandrovna Tulisova from Archangel Oblast. The flippant attitude U.S. President Reagan takes to the future of peace and the destines of peoples and countries arouses profound and heartfelt indignation, writes Pavel Andryevich Stukalov, our regular listener from Votkinsk. He calls the White House's present policy playing with fire, a dangerous game that threatens life on earth. But why has this game been started by the Reagan administration? I shall ask Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin to answer this question, which is contained in letters from Comrades Lavrov from Sverdlovsk, Kupriyanov from Perm, and Sokolov from Krasnodar. Over to you.

[Bovin] For a start, I would not call it a game. What is involved is the well-considered foreign policy strategy of a certain group of the American bourgeoisie which is currently in power. The whole point is that the strategic orientation we are now dealing with is a kind of reaction to the whole series of foreign policy failures and defeats that the United States suffered in the seventies. Let us recall them -- there was Iran, Vietnam, and Nicaragua, there was the collapse of the Portuguese empire, (?there was Ethiopia). Every such occurrence -- since the Americans have always practically supported all these moribund reactionary puppet regimes -- every such occurrence, every such social change, naturally led to a reduction in America's political influence and prestige. This explains Reagan, and his stand on restoring U.S. greatness, reinstating the United States as the greatest, mightiest power, as they say, and so on.

Since the philosophy of Reagan and friends is very primitive -- from their point of view, for instance, everything that happens in the world which they do not like must inevitably involve the hand of Moscow, with KGB agents (?going around) staging coups and setting everyone against the United States -- since they proceed from such an extremely primitive philosophy of history, then from their point of view policy toward

the Soviet Union must above all become tougher. That is the initial premise of the specific policy of stoking up tension and of confrontation which we have come up against. I repeat -- it is an attempt to take social and political revenge for the defeats that the United States suffered in the seventies.

[Doronin] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, perhaps there are some objective causes in the purely economic sphere.

[Bovin] Generally speaking, one could mention the influence of the military-industrial complex, and so on and so forth, but the whole point is that this influence existed earlier. The American bourgeoisie, you see, is not homogeneous. There is a constant struggle within the American ruling class, a struggle between groups, between factions -- Lenin called them factions -- some of which support detente, for some sort of modus vivendi with the Soviet Union, and when these people came to power there was detente in the seventies. Then, under the influence of all the events I have been talking about the more extreme reactionary wing of the American bourgeoisie began gradually to gain strength, and it seized the White House.

[Doronin] Evidently a contributory factor was also the transfer of capital to military branches of industry in connection with the economic crisis.

[Bovin] That is a constant factor. Naturally, that has some influence, but that is a factor which constantly exists, and Eisenhower, strange as it may seem, was the first to warn Americans to fear the military-industrial complex. Since then its standing has become stronger in America, and it naturally exerts an enormous influence on U.S. policies. On the other hand, however, another group of the ruling bourgeoisie will come to power and, although the military-industrial complex will remain the same, America's foreign policy position can change. Thus there is no strict link here.

[Doronin] I have seen it put in the following manner: Reagan and his group will leave the White House, then Washington's policies can change.

[Bovin] I entirely agree with that. Perhaps Reagan will sit out another 4 years in the White House -- that cannot be ruled out -- and there will be another 4 years of difficulties with the United States, but sooner or later he will be forced to go because the objective needs of the United States itself, and its own national interests, if they are not approached from the narrow framework adopted by Reagan, naturally call for normal relations with the Soviet Union, and sooner or later that will happen. One would, of course, like it to be sooner.

[Doronin] The next group of questions is connected with Soviet-American talks on nuclear disarmament, the talks in Geneva on strategic armaments and on Euromissiles. Listeners ask the following: The United States is demonstrating a complete unwillingness to reach an agreement on disarmament at these talks. That is what Comrade Kozlov, a listener from Leningrad, and Comrade Makarov from Krivozerye, whom we have already mentioned, write. So why are they taking part in these talks?

[Bovin] There are two aspects here. There is a judicial concept -- alibi. It is a judicial concept, as you well know. It is a sort of alibi because, of course, when Reagan started to scare everyone with war and started, so to speak, to brandish his bomb, he wanted to scare us, but he especially scared West Europe, and he scared the Americans themselves. There was an increase in public pressure -- incidentally, pressure from his allies in West Eurpoe, too -- pressure from the West European public and the American public, pressure to the effect that he had to agree to talks with the Soviet Union.

And that is the origin of the duality of his policy. On the one hand he is launching a program of modernizing his strategic forces, as well as his conventional forces, and, on the other hand, he is being compelled, nevertheless, in order to show somehow that he is not the terrible warmonger he is made out to be, to conduct talks with us.

Such is the dualism of his policy. But there is a further shade of meaning here. On the one hand, this element of alibi, of demagogy, is indeed very strong, and it is perhaps the main one. But, on the other hand, even among the people who surround Reagan, for all their anticommunism, for all the adventurist nature of their policies, there are minds and intellects which are pondering the consequences of the whole business, and they have disposed Reagan, they are disposing him, toward the view that one must nevertheless attempt to reach an agreement on something with Moscow. But the whole unacceptability of the American position rests for us in the fact that all the compromises which they have so far proposed to us essentially envisage that we will disarm much more than the Americans. Thus, the main principle for us is infringed -- the principle of the equal security of the sides.

[Doronin] The question that arises here -- it is one that interests our listeners -- is whether the Americans are possibly blocking these talks deliberately in order to hamper the process of reaching agreement.

[Bovin] By and large, I have the impression that yes, to a large extent, there (?is an attempt) to deliberately prolong the talks, to rearm, to install some new missiles in Europe, for example. But what they say is: If we install the new missiles in Europe, the Soviet Union will start to talk seriously (?at the talks) and if we, say, install the MX missiles in America, then the Soviet Union will start taking the talks seriously. This is the concept of collecting bargaining trumps. Of course, we will never permit America to gain military superiority; that is quite clear.

But we are also prepared to try for wide-ranging agreements and to seek compromise. But what is a compromise? A compromise is when both sides concede something in order to move forward together. But what has been happening until now is that the Americans have been demanding unilateral concessions from us. Of course, nothing will come of that.

[Doronin] There is another issue connected with this problem. It is raised by Comrade Kalinkin, a listener from Syktyvkar. How is it, he writes, that despite differences, serious differences, in trade, economic and financial problems, the United States has nevertheless succeeded in enlisting support for its military-political plans -- take, for instance, the Williamsburg conference?

[Bovin] This is what we Marxists call class interests. Each of these states, of course, have their own national interests, which frequently contradict one another, and we can see that, we can see these real differences. But when it comes to relations between East and West, then they have a common social interest, class interest, because these are all capitalist states, and the monopolistic bourgeoisie is in power everywhere there. The class interest takes the upper hand over the contradictions which really exist.

French Foreign Policy Changes

[Doronin] Now, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, a question regarding France. The letters of our listeners, Comrades Peturov from Novosibirsk, Bibik from Poltava Oblast, Kuchmezov from Nalchik, and Shcheportov from Smolensk Oblast, and in the collective letter from a group of workers from the Krasnoarmeyskiy Sovkhoz in Voronezh Oblast, question the reasons for the recent changes in France's foreign policy course, particularly with reference to the Soviet Union.

They write: Soviet-French relations were quite recently regarded as a kind of model for others -- regular political consultations were held, extensive economic and scientific-technological and cultural links were maintained -- suddenly, to put it mildly, there came the unfriendly actions of the French Government with regard to workers at Soviet missions, the wave of anti-Sovietism. Included in this same chain of events are the unreserved French support for the plans to deploy the new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe, and the signing of the Williamsburg statement of an anti-Soviet nature. How is all this to be understood, our listeners ask?

[Bovin] I am not sure that I have any sort of 100-percent ready-made answer to these questions, but let us think on them for a while. First, Mitterrand is more than just a name -- he is the leader of a certain party, the French Socialist Party, and he came to power and is implementing the program of this socialist party, in particular on foreign policy questions. And it is this very anticommunist, Atlanticist character of Mitterrand's foreign policy that lies at the basis of the program of the party which he represents. For example, from Giscard d'Estaing's viewpoint, there is France and there is the Soviet Union, and each of these countries has its own state interests. Such was the system of coordinates in which Giscard d'Estaing in fact built his foreign policy. Mitterrand, however, has a different system of coordinates on which his program is built. On the one hand, there is all the stuff about the totalitarian, antidemocratic Soviet Union, and on the other hand, the free democratic France. You can see there is a complete difference in approach here. And when Mitterrand approaches foreign policy from such an ideological viewpoint, then it inevitably, so to speak, urges him toward pursuing an anti-Soviet, anticommunist policy, and this is what is being manifested in his actual deeds. This is the main point, in my view. He is acting here in conformity with the dictates of his own ideology and his world outlook as a right-wing socialist.

But there is another aspect, concerning not so much strategy as tactics. The point is that when Mitterrand was not yet in power, when they were preparing for the elections, and then when he came to power, the West was frequently writing that here comes Mitterrand, a socialist; France will now go over to the East, now he will betray the West, and so on and so forth. This is the kind of provocative pressure that came from the right. And I would say it is not out of the question that, apparently trying psychologically to defend himself from such things, he goes over even more sharply to the side of Atlanticism to prove that he is absolutely loyal to Western values, loyal to NATO, loyal to Western democracy and ideology, etc. So evidently this factor, too, has some influence -- this stressing, for show, that he belongs to the West. And the result, as you all know, is France's considerable lurch toward the Atlantic policy. It is no accident. for example, that the NATO session has just been held in Paris, for the first time since 1966 when, as everyone knows, de Gaulle took France out of the NATO military organization. All this is well known. So, unfortunately, this evolution in French policy has actually come about, and we have to reckon with this as a fact and modify our own policy accordingly.

Events in Middle East

[Doronin] Thank you, Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich. Now we will turn to the events in the Near East. Our listeners, participant in the Great Patriotic War Grigorevich Kulesh from Ust-Ilimski, Comrade Starushenkev from Nakhodka, Comrade Mosko from Sumy Oblast, and Gilev from Perm, are asking what is now the situation in the Near East, 1 year after the beginning of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon. Pavel Yepifanovich Demchenko answers your questions, comrades.

[Demchenko] Isreal set itself three main aims 1 year ago: It wanted, first, to crush the PLO, whose main centers were located at that time in Lebanese territory; second, to subordinate Lebanon to its influence; and finally, to inflict a blow on Syria and to undermine its capacity for resistance to imperialist and Zionist intrigues. Did Israel achieve its aims? How can this question be answered?

Having displayed courageous resistance to the aggressor, the PLO and its combat units were forced to desert Beirut. But the Palestinian resistance was not crushed. The PLO has proved its vitality. It is continuing the fight for the restoration of the rights of its people which have been flouted. The Syrian troops likewise deserted Beirut. However, they regrouped and, possessing new weapons, particularly anti-aircraft missiles, they remain a threatening force to Israel. The political position of Damascus, too, is unwavering. The relations between the Palestinian resistance movement and Syria have even been consolidated recently, particularly in the Lebanese Al-Biqa' Valley.

However, there are points which arouse great alarm. It is primarily a question of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement, signed in mid-May. For the sides which signed it are in positions of obvious inequality. One side, that is, Israel, is speaking from a position of strength and dictating its conditions, while the other is forced to reckon with the fact that substantial parts of its territory are occupied and the guns of the invaders are trained on its capital. It is hard to believe that in different conditions the Lebanese Government would have agreed to put its signature to an agreement whereby it surrenders control of a substantial part of its territory to Israel. Furthermore, an attempt has been made to essentially legitimize the indefinite presence in Lebanon of foreign troops, primarily U.S. troops. There are 1,800 U.S. Marines in Lebanon. Today it is possible to assert that as a result of last year's Israeli aggression against Lebanon, an extremely dangerous situation has developed in the Near East, fraught with the threat of the consolidation of the dominance of U.S. imperialism in this region, the spread of the scale of Israeli expansion and the dragging through by force of a capitulatory solution of the Palestinian problem by liquidation.

[Doronin] Pavel Yepifanovich, many of our listeners ask why the criminal actions of Israel have remained unpunished, although, as Kuznetsova from Leningrad writes, the Israeli Zionists, together with the U.S. Zionists, deserve trials similar to the Nuremberg trials of the Nazi war criminals.

[Demchenko] Yes, our listeners are absolutely right. The crimes of the Israelis are comparable to those crimes committed by the Hitlerites in the occupied territories. Israel can commit its bloody crimes primarily because it is supported to the hilt by U.S. imperialism. Weapons, economic credit, political support -- all this is forthcoming from Washington, and Israel acts screened by the military and political might of the United States. We also have to bear in mind another circumstance, that is, international Zionism. At the moment there are several hundred powerful Zionist organizations throughout the world adequately ramified, financially well off, which are providing support to Israel, and in practice the rulers of Israel are carrying out the will of both U.S. and international imperialism and international Zionism.

[Doronin] In this context a question quite rightly arises, and our listeners are asking it: What prevents the Arab states from rallying against the aggressors and their patrons?

[Demchenko] The Arab world -- and this is now 22 independent countries -- is very heterogeneous in political, economic, and social terms. The countries have different attitudes and pursue different domestic and foreign policies.

A situation has now come about where, even on acute problems such as the attitude toward the Lebanese-Israeli agreement, the positions of the Arab countries do not coincide. They have not succeeded in forming a united front against the Israeli aggressor. They are not succeeding in forming a united front against U.S. imperialism.

Unfortunately, certain countries have entered into collusion with both U.S. imperialism and the Israeli aggressors and are trying to draw maximum benefit from that position whereby they have set themselves in opposition to the other Arab countries. Among these countries, for example, is Egypt. As you know, Egypt signed a peace agreement with Israel and receives enormous credits and large consignments of weapons from the United States. A similar stance has been adopted recently by a number of other Arab countries, for example, Sudan, Somalia, and so forth.

[Doronin] Could you dwell in particular on the stance of Saudi Arabia? This is requested by, among others, Comrade Balakin, a listener from Nikolayevsk-na-Amure.

[Demchenko] The thing is that Saudi Arabia is one of the key Arab countries. It is the richest Arab oil state, a country which has enormous financial resources and can thus influence the course of events in the Near East. The Saudi leadership wants to play the part of intermediary, if you like, a go-between, a sort of bridge between the United States and a number of Arab States, including the PLO. On the other hand it finances Syria even, the PLO, and conservative Arab countries also receive credits from it -- Jordan, for example. At the same time, Saudi Arabia, acting from a position of Arab nationalism and Muslim fundamentalism, considers that Israel should release the holy lands in Jerusalem and return them to the jurisidiction of the Arab states, in particular to the jurisdiction of a future independent Palestinian state. Saudi Arabia supports the Palestine liberation movement, but this support is of a special kind -- the Saudi leadership does not want the Palestinian movement to acquire a progressive social character; it wants everything to be channeled into appeasement, into the conservative and bourgeois streams within the PLO, and it finally wants the Arab plan for a Near East settlement drawn up in Fez and the Reagan plan to be somehow combined and for a single stance to be worked out which would satisfy both the Arabs on the one hand and the Americans on the other.

[Doronin] Pavel Yepifanovich, I shall quote you an excerpt from a letter from Comrade Kulesh in Ust-Ilimsk. He writes: I, like millions of others throughout the world, am concerned over the fate of the much-suffering Palestinian people. What are the current prospects for a settlement of the Palestinian question?

[Demchenko] After the PLO combat detachments left Beirut, the Palestinian fighting units found themselves further from their homeland than ever before. However, quite strong detachments remain, as before, in the Al-Biqa' Valley in Lebanon, where they continue to confront the Israeli forces occupying Lebanon. As far as the political side of this question is concerned, the PLO continues to insist on the need for an independent Palestinian state to be created on the lands occupied by Israel in 1967, in other words, the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip. That demand is supported by many countries including, first and foremost, Syria, Libya, Democratic Yemen, Algeria, and a number of other states. But, as we have already mentioned, there is no unity in the Arab world, and a number of Arab states regard the Palestinian problem very passively, thus hampering a solution to the problem and the struggle for the liberation of the territories occupied by Israel.

[Doronin] Now, please, another question -- what about the threat of an Israeli attack on Syria. How real is it? This question is asked by many listeners, in particular, Comrade Gilev from Perm.

[Demchenko] I recently visited the Near East, including Lebanon and Syria, and I put this question to many politicians, to Syrian Foreign Minister Khaddam, and Al-Fahum, one of the PLO leaders. I must say that they are all of the opinion that the threat of an Israeli attack on Syria is more real, and that Syria must show the maximum vigilance in order not to be caught unawares by the strike. In the opinion of certain Western journalists with whom I have had occasion to speak in the past few days, Israel, in planning this attack against Syria, wants first and foremost to carry out a strike against its forces in the Al-Biqa' Valley in Lebanon where, as I have already said, the PLO detachments are also stationed. In this way Israel is counting on sweeping from its path the chief obstacle that prevents the Near East problem, including the Palestinian problem, from being solved the U.S.-Israeli way. But that is not all, for Syria and the forces supporting it have essentially become the main obstacle to the implementation of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement. That document has turned out to be easier to sign than to implement, and the Syrians' withdrawal from the game would allow the Israelis and Americans to implement that agreement foisted upon Lebanon. I will use a quote here -- Israeli Deputy Prime Minister Ehrlich said: Israel will very soon put the Syrians in their place and thus solve the Lebanese problem. So, as you can see, the threat is imminent. It proves yet again that the situation in the Near East remains highly explosive and that a fresh military conflict may break out at any moment.

[Doronin] What, in this case, will the Soviet Union -- or may the Soviet Union -- do?

[Demchenko] As far as the stance of the Soviet Union is concerned it, as you know, advocates a peaceful settlement of the Near East problem. It has put forward a six-point plan for a just settlement of this problem. The Soviet Union has long suggested convening an international conference with the participation of all parties with an interest in the Near East conflict, and during my recent trip to Arab countries which I mentioned, the benefit of such a conference was stated by the Syrian foreign minister, King Husayn of Jordan, many PLO leaders and Lebanese politicians. It is only by restoring the legitimate interests of all the peoples in the Near East that peace may be restored in this part of the world.

As far as Syria in particular in concerned, I should like to recall that the Soviet Union has concluded a friendship and cooperation treaty with this Arab state. In accordance with that treaty the Soviet Union gives Syria all possible aid and support, including for the purpose of strengthening the country's defense, and gives political support at all levels, including at the United Nations. But, I repeat, our country's stance is that all problems should be solved by peaceful means, through talks, in the interests of all the sides involved -- both the victims of aggression and the Israeli people.

Central American Developments

[Doronin] Thank you, Pavel Yepifanovich. Let us now turn to another region. Letters sent to our program by Comrades Yermokhin from the Moscow region, Zhiluktov from Novorossiysk and Petrovich from Minsk ask us to say something about the causes of the present turbulent events in Central America. Why has this particular region been enveloped by the national liberation movement? Here is Juan Juanovich Cobo to answer your questions, comrades.

[Cobo] According to the primitive propaganda picture drawn by the Reagan administration -- and it must be owned that by virtue of its simplicity and assessibility, this picture succeeds in making an impresssion on many simple-minded people -- according to this picture, everything can be explained in simple terms. The White House alleges that revolution is being brought into Central America from outside, in the present instance from Cuba, behind which the Soviet Union allegedly stands.

Due to the geographical proximity of the countries of the region, it is then artificially transferred from one country to another. In reality, and the representatives of the ruling circles of the United States and other Western countries realize this perfectly well, things are much more complicated. What is common to all the countries enveloped by the present revolutionary process in Central America -- both Nicaragua, where the revolution has triumphed and which is now heroically defending itself against aggression by CIA mercenaries, and El Salvador and Guatemala -- is an archaic and outmoded socioeconomic and political structure, the fact that they have hopelessly fallen behind the 20th century -- admittedly, this applies to a lesser degree to El Salvador -- and have reached an impasse in their development.

In order to preserve this situation, the local reaction relies on brute force, having in the past halted by fire and the sword all attempts -- by the Sandinist movement in Nicaragua, the peasant uprising in El Salvador in the thirties and the democratic process in Guatemala under the Armas government in the early fifties -- all attempts by these countries to escape the vicious circle of backwardness and dependence. Formerly the oligarchies and imperialism succeeded in this way in freezing development in these countries, but that could not continue indefinitely. History has its laws, and they cannot be eternally flouted. Everything that was driven underground in the past has now resurfaced.

Moreover, I should like to stress that what is involved is not so much the democratic liberation struggle or the struggle for social progress; this struggle has significant elements of a national liberation, patriotic struggle. After all, the United States was behind the killers of Sandino, behind the Salvadoran [word indistinct] colonels, and it was the CIA that sent its mercenaries into Guatemala to topple the Arbenz government, after which the U.S. imperialists unceremoniously and openly supported regimes that suited them in these three countries, as distinct from other Latin American countries where the U.S. presence was quiet and inconspicuous. It remains as such, which is not so injurious to national sentiment. Thus, in the present instance elements of struggle for democracy are combined with elements of struggle for sovereignty, and this has created an explosive mixture of force that confers irresistible power to the popular movement in Central America, which we are witnesses to today.

Judge for yourselves: If the revolution -- as Washington asserts -- was being artificially foisted on these countries, could it really have taken such deep root there? Powerful forces have now started operating openly in these countries, forces which have been struggling for their aims for dozens of years, hidden and inconspicuous, about which the world knew nothing or very little, and these forces were biding their time until the hour arrived for a direct offensive against oligarchy and imperialism.

Note, for instance, the circumstances in which the struggle in El Salvador is being mounted. It is a tiny country, the smallest and most densely populated in the continent. There are almost no mountains; they have been developed. The forests have been cleared to make way for plantations. There is also a close network of roads. Troops can be transferred from one side of El Salvador to the other in 5 to 6 hours. From the viewpoint of military operations, all this works to the disadvantage of the partisans and favors the troops of the oligarchy. But there is another factor, the moral and political one. We can see, year after year, the struggle becoming increasingly persistent, the patriots gaining in strength and forcing their initiative on the enemy. Despite the fact that Pentagon and CIA interference is growing, that large-scale arms shipments are reaching the country from the United States, and that special antipartisan units along the lines of the (Atlacatl), (Atonal) and (Ramon Belloso) composed of Salvadoran cutthroats are being set up at U.S. military bases, squabbles are intensifying in the oligarchy camp and it is becoming increasingly difficult to replace personnel losses. Thus, there are very deep-seated reasons why things are literally getting too hot for the Salvadoran military and Pentagon advisers.

[Doronin] Juan Juanovich, what about the influence of the revolutionary example?

[Cobo] Yes, This factor, unquestionably, cannot be denied. To some extent it is having an effect. The victory in Nicaragua was a stimulus for the struggle in El Salvador, while the latter started the struggle in Guatemala. But it is a moral, psychological factor. It has nothing in common with the export of revolution in the sense understood by imperialist propagandists, and the decisive role is played by the deep-seated reasons we talked about earlier -- the domination of oligarchy, which does not want to renounce its privileges and mercilessly oppresses the people, as well as the overt and brazen interference of imperialism, which is inconsistent with the spirit of our times.

This set of factors is at present absent in the major and most developed countries on the continent. The revolutionary process is naturally developing there as well, but in other forms, conditioned by the particular features of historical, social, economic, and political development.

[Doronin] There is one more question. In fact, the system of imperialist oppression tears in places where it is thin, and, unexpected though it might seem at first glance, it is thin where represssive dictatorships, founded upon naked force, hold sway. Why is this?

[Cobo] It is because more complex and flexible political systems, as exist in a number of Latin American countries, have -- how can I put it? -- more elasticity; they can resort to social maneuvering, they can make certain concessions to the lower classes and quickly change their tactics if a social threat arises, letting the steam escape for a time from the cauldron of social tension. But the military dictatorships of the old school are like cast iron, hard but brittle, breaking under a strong blow. And life under the yoke of such dictatorships is quite intolerable.

[Doronin] Juan Juanovich, a number of our listeners ask how one can explain the catastrophically rapid growth in the debts, the foreign debts, which the countries of Latin American owe to the imperialist states.

[Cobo] So much has been written and said about the causes of the growth of the foreign debts of the developing countries as a whole that it is probably not worth repeating it. I shall merely attempt to note certain specific features of the problem. The foreign debt of the countries of the continent is enormous, and it is growing at breakneck speed. At the end of 1980 it amounted to $200 billion, which is almost 10 times more than at the start of the sixties. Now, the total has reached close to $250 billion. Whence the scale, whence the speed involved here? The point is that the most developed countries of the region -- Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina -- which are economically included in the world capitalist system, have reached quite a high level of development, higher than the most developed states in Asia and Africa. This produces higher demand for technology, for example, which has to be brought in from the developed countries of the West, above all, the United States. At the same time, year after year the Western powers hike the price of technology, and simultaneously knock down the prices of traditional Latin America export goods and effectively boycott ready-made products from the countries of Latin America. The profit drawn from these countries today, when the capitalist world is in the control of the transnational corporations, is growing. While at one time it amounted to $3.50 for every dollar invested, it now stands at $10 and more. All this, together with other factors, is draining the life-blood of the economies of the countries of the continent and, as we have already said, this happens increasingly with every passing year.

The situation is also exacerbated by the consequences of the energy crisis and the general crisis of capitalism, whose burdens the United States is striving to transfer partially to its Latin American partners. Even Mexico, which in the past decade experienced an economic boom in connection with the discovery of very rich oil deposits, is now in the grip of a crisis. Last year the state had to nationalize the private banks in order to block channels of escape of capital and to introduce an austerity package. Naturally, all these processes are leading to an exacerbation of relations between the imperialist center and the Latin American provinces. What is the upshot? On the one hand, the ruling circles of the countries of Latin America are linked with their Western capitalist colleagues by class solidarity. On the other, the economic contradictions between them are growing. The Reagan administration has taken a tough line on this issue, rejecting all requests and proposals from their own neighbors for a review of the nature of economic relations. This is forcing the Latin American states to increasingly rally together against Washington and its closest partners in this issue.

[Doronin] Where do we go from here?

[Cobo] Objectively speaking, the result is that in Latin America imperialism is, on the left flank, encountering powerful revolutionary movements which it cannot hold back, while on the right, and even in the center, it is encountering resistance even from the ruling circles of Latin America. It is encountering that new Latin American solidarity which Fidel Castro has spoken about. The situation is an unenviable one, but it stems logically from the very nature of imperialism.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNTABLE'

LD121630 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0845 GMT 12 Jun 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, international affairs journalist; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio foreign affairs political commentator]

Soviet-Finnish Talks Viewed

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrades, radio listeners. We shall open today's program with an analysis of the Soviet-Finnish talks which took place during Finnish President Mauno Koivisto's official visit to our country. As you already know, the results of these talks were reviewed during a regular session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, where it was noted with satisfaction that this visit marked the further deepening of friendly and good-neighbor relations between the USSR and Finland. In approving the talks that were held, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo stressed that the outcome and the documents signed in the course of the talks represent a new important step in the consistent development of all-round cooperation between the USSR and the Finnish Republic, and they make a useful contribution toward the consolidation of peace and security in Europe.

To begin with, one should note the signing of a protocol on extending the 1948 treaty between the Soviet Union and Finland by another 20 years. Soviet-Finnish relations already have a good tradition and a reliable foundation, but I would like to note that in current conditions, when the international situation is complicated, this new -- and also extremely important and significant -- step forward in the development of Soviet-Finnish relations naturally goes in its significance far beyond the framework of bilateral relations. This fact indicates that Soviet-Finnish relations are not subject to the fluctuating situation in international politics, and that they always remain -- even in complicated conditions -- a factor of stability and reliability. This is a very important point.

The second point to which I would like to draw attention is the confirmation of the principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, and the fruitfulness of implementing this principle.

[Bovin] It may even be said that Soviet-Finnish relations set an example for relations based on the principle of peaceful coexistence. And in general, many political aspects related to this principle are very clearly observable here -- for example, economic problems such as unemployment and inflation which haunt the countries of Western Europe. All this is felt considerably less in Finland because the stable and regular trade turnover with the Soviet Union creates stability for Finnish industry, stable jobs, orders -- and all this is generally very advantageous for Finland. Naturally, it is to our advantage too, since we receive a wide range of wonderful goods made in Finland.

[Shishlin] One-fourth of the Finnish trade turnover results from trade with the Soviet Union. It should be noted that Finland, a relatively small country, represents approximately 4.5 percent of the Soviet foreign trade turnover, a rather remarkable figure for a relatively small country. It is very pleasurable that in itself the climate which can be described as political confidence, stable political confidence between two neighboring states, makes it possible also to map out new prospects for the development of this cooperation. I would say in general that even now the level of cooperation between the USSR and Finland is high, in the economic sphere as well as in the political and cultural spheres. However, the results of the visit make it definitely possible to expect that Soviet-Finnish links in all directions are going to move forward.

[Levin] In this connection, I would like to note that the Soviet Union and Finland share essentially the same position on such an important problem as the creation of nuclear-free zones in Europe. It is known that 20 years ago, Finnish President Kekkonen submitted a proposal to create a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. The Soviet Union unequivocally supported this idea, and made its own contribution to developing it further.

Speaking at the dinner in honor of the Finnish delegation and the Finnish president, Comrade Andropov said that the Soviet Union is not just sympathetic to the idea of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, but is also ready to assist in its establishment. We not only would undertake to respect the status of such a zone, but we would also be ready to discuss the question of certain -- and substantial -- measures applicable to our own territory bordering on the zone, measures which would enhance the strengthening of its nuclear-free status. The Soviet Union could also discuss with the interested parties the question of conferring a nuclear-free status on the Baltic Sea maritime area. These are concrete proposals submitted by the Soviet Union and directed toward broadening the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone.

It is very indicative that not only our Finnish guests, but also Swedish Prime Minister Palme, assessed very positively the proposal to confer a nuclear-free status on the Baltic Sea maritime area. This point deserves attention also in the sense that the Soviet Union and Finland are both striving toward deepening the process of detente and toward putting an end to negative developments in Europe. This is what brings about a very sick -- and I would say -- violent reaction among capitalist countries and in the West. Therefore, Finland is occasionally subjected to attacks. Incidentially, it was during the Finnish president's visit to the Soviet Union that Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone indulged in one such, very crude -- I would say -- attack.

Nakasone's 'Finnish' Remark

[Bovin] It must be said, that certain circles in the West have always looked with displeasure on the good Soviet-Finnish relations and generally have been trying to assert that, as it were, good relations with the Soviet Union curb Finland's sovereignty and its foreign political activities.

They even started using the term "Finlandization." Using this term, Nakasone spoke about the possibility of Japan's "Finlandization." This was followed by a decisive protest from Helsinki, an official protest.

[Shishlin] Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, it is true that now the Japanese and their official circles seem to be distancing themselves from this statement. They are now saying that this was an unhappy mistranslation, it was misunderstood, and so forth: that they respect self-reliant and independent Finland, and know that the Finns are a tenacious and brave people, and so on.

[Bovin] Well, they could hardly say anything else at this point. Moreover, this is generally the case with Nakasone, as it was earlier the case with Reagan -- he would say something, and afterward they would say: Well, it was misunderstood, it was mistranslated. But the understanding and the translation were quite correct. It is simply that what was said was incorrect, so much so, that it was necessary later to extricate oneself from the statement. That is the problem, and that is just what happened to Nakasone.

[Levin] Incidentally, in connection with this political clash between Japan and Finland, remember this instance: On the same day, two different Soviet newspapers -- IZVESTIYA and PRAVDA -- carried major articles. The IZVESTIYA article dealt with the development of Soviet-Finnish cooperation in shipbuilding. In particular, the article quoted facts indicating that Valmet, a shipbuilding firm in Finland, had new shipyards built on the understanding that its main customer would be the Soviet Union, and these calculations were fully justified. At the same time PRAVDA published a lengthy article by Comrade Afanasyev, the paper's editor-in-chief, describing the difficulties experienced by shipbuilding in Japan. The article quoted, as an example, that now Japanese shipbuilding firms can only dream of getting orders for just 50 percent of the shipyard capacities which were built with a view to a boom in world shipbuilding. This calculation turned out to be wrong. This feature alone, this example, goes to show that the development of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union is a factor of economic stability.

If Japan is to look so closely at Finland's policy, it would be worth while paying particular attention to the fruitfulness of economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. It should be said, however, that business circles in Japan are showing considerable interest in this respect. It seems to me, that if the Nakasone government were not putting restrictive pressure upon business circles, the successes would be considerably greater.

[Shishlin] Returning again to the results of the visit by our Finnish neighbors in Moscow, it should be said that the international response and resonance to the outcome of the visit have, on the whole, been favorable of course. They have been favorable both on the level of grasping the position of the Soviet Union -- how the USSR builds its relations with its neighbors -- and on the level of the attitude of international public opinion and international political circle to the role Finnish policy plays today in Europe and even in world affairs.

U.S.-USSR Stands on Disarmament

[Levin] Another major event, an important event, has taken place this week. A new round of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on strategic arms limitation and reduction began in Geneva. On the eve of the resumption of this round of the negotiations, U.S. President Reagan announced what U.S. propaganda asserted to be new proposals. It seems to me, however, that Reagan was primarily addressing himself not to the participants in the Geneva talks, but to the NATO foreign ministers who began their 2-day conference in Paris the next day.

This announcement was first and foremost, aimed at creating the impression that the United States really aspires to negotiate with the Soviet Union and aspires to seek mutually acceptable agreements. Reagan even came out with a phrase to the effect that if the Soviet Union shows the same flexibility as the United States, then, he said, matters will take a turn for the better.

First of all, the United States unfurled a program to develop new MX and Midgetman strategic missiles. Now it is engaged in political camouflage of these... military programs and is speaking of its alleged desire for negotiations and dialogue and its desire to seek agreement. However, ...

[Bovin -- interrupting] Well now, here I would disagree with you, Viktor Nikolayevich, because the Americans do indeed want an agreement with us and I am absolutely convinced of this. What they want, however, is an agreement which will result in the Soviet Union disarming unilaterally and the United States receiving military and political supremacy. That is the type of agreement they want, of course.

The Americans are talking now about a flexible position there, about compromise proposals. So far, however, these compromises have been distinguished precisely by the fact that they have taken excellent account of U.S. interests but have taken no account of our interests at all.

[Shishlin] Of course, like any proposals, even those which from the very start give rise to considerable doubts as to their constructive nature, they require a certain degree of reflection and study. Such work is naturally being done in Moscow. This has always been the case, and so it is now. It cannot but be said, however, as is being pointed out here, that Washington's position is one-sided in nature. This is as clear as daylight. What is involved here? As is known, the Americans previously proposed at the negotiations that the number of nuclear warhead carriers, those having intercontinental parameters of operation, be reduced to 850 units on each side with the Soviet Union being required, in the opinion of the United States, to reduce its land-based missiles and thereby wreck the entire structure of its strategic arms.

Now the United States and President Reagan do not state the number of carriers representing the level which the strategic weapons of both sides should reach. Well, it is more or less made clear that this level is to be higher that the 850 figure. The American press quotes simply the figure of 1,200. It is characteristic, however, that the difference, the imbalance in the United States' favor which Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich has already mentioned, is wholly maintained in the position expounded just recently by U.S. President Reagan. They figure once again, then, that the Soviet strategic potential, which primarily consists of launchers of land-based means, should be reduced the most.

[Bovin] The Americans, then, argue that land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles are, as they say, the most destabilizing type of strategic weapon. This is not the case at all, however, on the whole. This was indeed the case at one time, but for instance, now that missiles on submarines have become much more accurate than they once were, there is no longer such a difference. Such arguments are, therefore, hard to accept.

[Levin] One forms the impression, on the whole, that these new proposals of Reagan's on the strategic arms limitation and reduction talks are just as new as the notorious interim option at the range nuclear arms reduction talks.

[Shishlin] In my opinion, it is most likely the case.

[Levin] We shall see what we shall see, of course, but for the time being, such a prominent politician as Schmidt, the former chancellor of the FRG, says that he does not see the seriousness of the United States's approach to the Geneva talks. It is hard to see this seriousness, very hard. Of course, I repeat, it seems to me that Reagan's announcement was primarily intended to create the appropriate background for the Paris conference of the NATO states' foreign ministers, with the aim of giving the impression that the United States is being flexible, something which has a certain importance for Western Europe.

French, UK Deployment Interests

All these new proposals remind me, however, of the emperor's new clothes in the famous Andersen fairy tale. The NATO foreign ministers' session in Paris, however, adopted no principally new decisions after the Williamsburg political declaration, which confirmed their intention to start deployment of the new U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe this year. It only ratified, properly speaking, this main tenet. The session itself, however, attracted particular attention primarily because that it was held in the French capital.

[Bovin] Yes, it is quite interesting, of course, because the NATO council has not met in Paris since De Gaulle withdrew France from the NATO military organization in 1966. The NATO Council is not formally the NATO military organization, so the French can say that nothing has formally changed. This is the case, yes. In fact, of course, everyone understands that since the NATO Council met in Paris, it means a further turn by France, so to speak, in the direction of Atlantic policy. This is clear to all.

[Levin] The Paris correspondent of the U.S. THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper has even directly cited the opinions of French officials, who, as he asserts, have made it clear that France's agreement to hold the NATO council session in Paris signifies that the country wishes to confirm the importance of its role in the defense of the West. In this connection, attention is of course drawn to the fact that on the eve of this meeting, French President Mitterrand in an interview to French television, once again expressed his opinions in regard to nuclear arms limitation in Europe, saying that he does not believe the Geneva negotiations can reach any agreement which would make it possible to avoid deployment of the new U.S. missiles.

[Shishlin] It is a fact that France has increased its nuclear armaments and adopted a broad-ranging military program against a background of the quite serious economic difficulties which France is experiencing -- to a considerable degree due, incidentally, to the economic policy being conducted by the U.S. Administration. It is also a fact that France is increasing and expanding military cooperation with West Germany. This also, in essence, amounts to France's involvement in NATO military efforts. It therefore seems that France today is almost trying to seize a leading role out in front in support of these U.S. plans to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of Western Europe. Perhaps....

[Bovin -- interrupting] It is competing with the FRG and Britain.

[Shishlin] With Britain, yes. They suppose perhaps that these U.S. plans, which of course attract general attention and give rise to general concern, of themselves simply create some sort of screen for France's own plans to increase nuclear arms.

[Bovin] Well, it may be so. I consider this to be one of the main grounds for Mitterrand's present policy, because behind the noise of this universal arms race which is coming to a head in Europe, it will of course be considerably easier for France and Britain to carry out their own programs for modernizing their strategic weapons against this general background. They are just doing what all the others are doing.

On the other hand, if, shall we say, something was agreed with the Americans in Geneva, the policy of both France and Britain would in fact look simply provocative against this background. They would become the chief stimulus of the arms race in Europe and they do not want that.

[Shishlin] Quite right. The French and the British position today in fact in one of these aspects torpedoing the U.S.-Soviet negotiations in Geneva which....

[Levin -- interrupting] Which are in any case going badly.

[Shishlin -- continuing] For which, indeed, there are not very clear prospects for success in any event.

[Levin] In connection with this, Ishould like to tell our radio listeners about a recent conversation with journalists broadcast on French television held by Egroges Seguy, member of the French Communist Party Central Committee, director of the General Labor Confederation Institute of Social History, and a member of the Coordinating Committee of the Call of the 100 [L'Appel des Cent] -- a sort of public organization in favor of peace. He is a very prominent figure in the French Communist Party.

Comrade Seguy criticized the position which France adopted in Williamsburg, pointing out that in contradiction to all the existing regulations, no consultations whatsoever were conducted with communist ministers on issues relating to France's position on the problems of peace and disarmament. Georges Seguy also underlined the need for the negotiations in Geneva to lead to nuclear deescalation on our continent. It is essential to hold negotiations regardless of which country the missiles deployed in Europe belong to, he said, in order to reject deployment of new missiles and then gradually eliminate those which are already deployed.

I believe that this statement of the French Communists' stance is of substantial importance, and that the fact that it has been made at this particular moment deserves attention.

Israeli Policies Viewed

And so the situation at the Geneva talks remains extremely complicated, extremely uncertain, and it may be said that there is a situation no less complicated in the Near East, too. I recall the Near East by virtue of the fact that 1 year has passed since the start of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon, 1 whole year and essentially the situation there remains....

[Bovin -- interrupting] The situation is difficult, and indeed the Israeli Knesset held a session this week and suddenly started to raise the following question: Deputies belonging to the opposition parties demanded the Knesset investigate the way in which this war in Lebanon was started and waged. This indicates that, in general, the Begin government is so adventurist that in Israel itself we have recently seen a buildup in the protests against this policy. But now the Knesset has not adopted this proposal, yet it is interesting that it has had made its appearance in the Knesset. And indeed, both the start of this war and its progress and what is now taking place -- of course, this is one of those tragic pages in the history of the whole Near East conflict, and one of the most adventurist pages in Israel's foreign policy.

And so 1 year has passed. What are the results? Let's discuss them calmly. What has Israel achieved? Well, it has achieved the withdrawal of the Palestinians from Lebanon. This is beyond doubt: the Palestinians have gone.

[Shishlin] From Beirut.

[Bovin] Yes, from Beirut. And it has created a situation in which Israeli troops are now in the southern half of Lebanon, although formally, according to the agreement, it is willing to withdraw them following a withdrawal of Syrian troops. But what was the reason for which this war was started? In order to strengthen Israel's security -- that was the main thing.

[Shishlin] That was their thesis.

[Bovin] Their thesis. And so, has this strengthened Israel's security or not? This is a fundamental question, and of course the answer is no, of course it is no, because the wall of hatred which stands between Israel and the Arabs and which represents the main measure of its lack of security has become even higher. The conflict has become even more acute. This is what Israel has achieved, in effect, and of course this indicates that this policy which Begin has been implementing has failed in principle. In no way does it serve Israel's security; quite the contrary.

[Shishlin] That is, it is being observed that partial solutions of all kinds, even those that might seem outwardly to be very advantageous for Israel, but which are solutions cutting across the interests of a just overall political settlement in the Near East, make the situation there even more explosive and fraught with the most tragic and unexpected turns in events -- tragic, what's more, not necessarily just for the Arabs, but for Israel, too.

[Bovin] Without a doubt, because in the end -- Israel's superiority is known, it has had its effect on all these wars that have taken place there -- more serious factors are gradually being set in motion: the Arabs are learning how to wage war; their unity there is capable of growing and in general all these blitzkreigs which Israel has waged in the past -- in Lebanon it was proved that the time of the blitzkrieg is over.

[Shishlin] Yes, it has been a long war, a war that has cost Israel a very great deal.

[Bovin] Yes, yes, yes, great sacrifices, and this puts Israel itself into a much more serious position. It is not fortuitous, I repeat, that within the country there is now this revival of utterances which are indeed antigovernment.

[Shishlin] All the same, I think you would agree that one of the lessons of the past year, a lesson which bears the imprint of this aggression against Lebanon, lies in the fact that any attempts to bring about a settlement against the interests of the Arabs, including the Arab people of Palestine, and any attempts to achieve a settlement without involving the true interested parties, including the Soviet Union, in the settlement of the Near East problem, will prove fairly shaky and unsteady.

[Bovin] They may yield certain partial results, but undoubtedly they do not lead to an overall settlement of the Near East problem. Of course, for Israel there are some advantages here. Take the disunity of the Arabs. What makes it possible for Israel to maneuver and to act aggressively? The disunity among the Arabs is one of the factors. And of course, this is understood perfectly well in Tel Aviv and they are perfectly able to make use of it. And so, if you please, yet another prerequisite for a settlement in the Near East is the establishment of more effective cooperation between Arab states, which unfortunately still does not exist, as the war in Lebanon has shown once again.

[Shishlin] Yes, and in this connection we cannot fail to mention, of course, that Israel nevertheless, making use of its position as a privileged client of the United States in the Near East, also has an opportunity to act here frequently in an arbitrary way, since it would not allow itself such behavior if it were not for the perfectly open support and patronage from Washington.

[Bovin] If it were not for this support, it would not be able to act at all.

[Levin] I would like to draw particular attention to this question. Over the past few days a number of reports in particular have appeared in the Israel press which expose, as they put it, the backdrop to the preparation by Israel for the invasion of Lebanon. One of these articles maintains that U.S. Secretary of State Haig, almost against the will of President Reagan, received Begin, for example, when he was in the United States and gave him his blessing for this aggression, that between them there was allegedly complete mutual understanding on the fact that it was necessary to attack Lebanon. The newspaper wrote directly that Haig told Begin that he was convinced that Israel must complete this affair and bring about the elimination of the PLO's presence in West Beirut. At the same time, it was said, supposedly, that Weinberger opposed this and that the President, also opposed it. But who was it, if not Weinberger, who equipped the Israeli troops with the latest American weapons, with all these vacuum bombs and cluster bombs and so forth?

Yes, of course, for a settlement in the Near East problem of the unity of the Arab peoples has an immense importance. Overall, this is a question which on the one hand is clear, but which on the other is very complex.

Difficulties for OAU Session

This week we have all been witnesses of the way in which the conference of heads of state and government of the OAU began, not without difficulty. The fact that this conference began is undoubtedly a great positive point. But it remains a fact, that on the way to this, a good many difficulties had to be overcome, and these were difficulties of different kinds. But unfortunately, not all African leaders appreciate that this plays into the hands of the forces of imperialism, that it plays into the hands of those who would like to preserve Africa in the condition, if not of a colony, then of a dependent territory, who would like to strengthen their former imperialist positions which contradict the interests of the peoples of the African Continent. The Soviet Union has an absolutely precise and clear position on this question. We are in favor of the unity of African countries, of strengthening the prestige of the OAU, of enhancing its role not merely in African affairs but on the international arena, despite the spirit of distrust and disunity which is introduced from outside.

[Bovin] I would add only the fact that this spirit of distrust and disunity is introduced from outside, that is correct, but it is also introduced from within this organization, and the difficulty amounts to getting the participants in this organization to understand that their general interests, the interests that demand the unity of the African peoples, that they are stronger, they are more significant, more important than the differences which currently divide them. And the fact that it was, nevertheless, possible to make these attempts to hold the 19th session of the assembly, indicates that they have no doubt understood this in Africa.

[Shishlin] Or that they are beginning to understand.

[Bovin] Or that they are beginning to understand.

[Levin] Life, therefore, is not a simple thing, but nevertheless there are grounds for optimism. The time we have available, esteemed comrades, has run out. We take our leave of you at this point. Thank you for your attention. All the best.

NATO COUNCIL SESSION ENDS; COMMUNIQUE SCORED

Confirms Deployment

LD101939 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1806 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] Paris, 10 Jun (TASS) -- TASS special correspondents Albert Balebanov and Oleg Karasev report:

The latest NATO Council session represented by the 16 member countries of the bloc at the foreign ministerial level has ended here today. The concluding communique depicts the position of the participant countries of the alliance on a whole series of very important international problems. Judging by this communique, the North Atlantic bloc intends to continue on its course of increasing its military potential and whipping up the arms race.

As NATO General Secretary Joseph Luns said at a press conference, the main result of the session was the confirmation of the December 1979 decision by the bloc to deploy 572 American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. At a meeting with journalists, U.S. Secretary of the State George Shultz let it be known that the United States had basically succeeded in foisting on its allies its own position concerning questions on the limitation of arms and disarmament which ignore the principles of equality and equal security.

The intention of the Atlantic alliance members to expand the "zone of NATO activity" under the pretext of defending their "common interests" arouses particular anxiety. This statement has been taken as a threat of military interference by NATO in the internal affairs of states lying outside the limits of the bloc's geographical boundaries.

During the current session the United States undertook its latest attempt to force its NATO partners to curtail trade and economic links with states of the socialist community. However, judging by the formulations of the communique and the explanations given at the press conference by French Minister of External Relations Claude Cheysson, Washington was not able to completely break the opposition of those allies who do not intend to do themselves damage by stopping relations of economic cooperation with socialist countries which are beneficial to themselves.

Instrument of U.S. Strategy

LD110530 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 10 Jan 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] The 2-day NATO Council session at foreign ministerial level ended today in Paris. The communique reasserts NATO's intention to deploy 572 American nuclear missiles on the territory of a number of West European countries, if concrete results are not attained at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. Attention is focused here on the fact that delegations of certain NATO member-countries have expressed reservations with regard to a number of clauses in the communique, in particular, those concerning the deployment of American missiles in West Europe. Our correspondent reports from Paris:

The NATO flag is hoisted in Paris, for the first time in 17 years. On 16 December 1966, this flag was lowered, with the emblem of the Atlantic shield, in the capital of the country which the Americans liked to call the "geographic heart of NATO." General de Gaulle turned the North Atlantic block out of France. Now, in leading circles in Paris, they are speaking more and more often about "Atlanticism" and the highest organ of the aggressive block is invited to the capital of France.

Luns, the NATO secretary-general, did not hide his satisfaction at a press conference. His words -- "it was necessary that France invite NATO, and she made the invitation; we are glad about this." And he repeatedly stressed: "France is a member of NATO, completely and utterly."

The opening of the session was arranged with deliberate ceremony. Mauroy, the prime minister, came to the Salle Pleyel for the opening ceremony. He welcomed the NATO Council to Paris. [Words indistinct] of striking words about the independence of France, as if there had been no Williamsburg, or the subjugation of Paris to the American military doctrine.

The Paris LE MONDE wrote that: The formality of holding of the NATO Council in Paris changes nothing, but in political terms, this meeting confirms that France is falling more and more into vassal-like dependence on the Americans.

Shultz, the American secretary of state, has one primary aim: to make the bloc's council confirm, in Paris itself, the decision to deploy new American missiles in West Europe -- what a come-down. Shultz and Luns have simploy conveyed to those NATO members who were not present in Williamsburg the notion of the Seven's support for the Washington militaristic course as a fait accompli. Denmark, Greece, and Holland expressed their concern about the growing nuclear arms race. Despite the fact that Belgium and Holland did not give permission for the deployment of American missiles on their territory, Washington is demanding the start of deployment -- in Britain, West Germany and Italy. A date has been named -- the end of December.

There is nothing new in (?this) final document. There are dutiful phrases about the bloc's love of peace, while in essence the decision adopted in Williamsburg concerning American missiles has been given the stamp of approval. The essence of Soviet peace-loving proposals is distorted to the limits here. Once more (?it is misrepresented) that supposedly it is the Soviet Union, and not Washington, who is creating obstacles at the talks in Geneva. Such brainwashing of public opinion is necessary to the Americans. Luns here, assured journalists that the moment one of the Pershing-II missiles is put in place in West Germany, then there will almost be a "coup" in favor of peace -- the Soviet Union will (?really) make concessions in Geneva. He did not mention that he was concerned about the interests of the Soviet people and its friends, about the interests of security. Our country would then take reciprocal, effective measures -- having in mind both the territory of the countries where the missiles will be deployed, and the territory of the United States itself. In a word, the session, which the Natoites will now call the "Parisian" one, once again confirmed that the North Atlantic bloc is merely an instrument of the aggressive American global strategy.

Communique 'Purest Demogogy'

LD112106 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 11 Jun 83

[Viktor Levin Commentary]

[Text] Judging by the final document of the 2-day session of NATO foreign ministers, there is cause for satisfaction in Washington. In its spirit and essence, this communique corresponds almost entirely to the aims of the present U.S. Administration. As in President Reagan's recent speeches, the NATO session document contains quite a number of pompous reflections about peace; however, as soon as the talk turns to definite deeds, all the camouflage of peace-loving assurances falls away, and the militarist essence of things becomes abundantly clear.

This appeared first of all, and clearest of all, in the approach of the NATO council session to the most urgent problem, in present conditions: limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. The communique announces that the ministers reaffirmed their intention to commence deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe at the end of 1983. The stipulation they make, that deployment will begin only if no concrete results are achieved at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, is the purest demagogy, which is exposed by the communique itself.

After this passage, the ministers hastened to assure the United States of full support for the efforts it has been making, the document says, for progress at Geneva. Moreover, they felt it necessary to extol once again the Reagan zero option. However, this option, as is understood even in the West, is nothing less than a demand for unilateral disarmament by the USSR, which our country, will naturally never accept.

In the government circles of a number of West European states, the view has long been expressed that the United States should move away from the zero option. However, at the Paris session, a step backward seems to have been taken. Washington has effectively obtained a mandate for further stalling in Geneva, in order to proceed without hindrance to the deployment of the new nuclear missiles.

Those who thoughtlessly play with the fates of human beings can credit themselves with a political goal scored. However, the target of this blatant irresponsibility, the peoples of Europe, will understand better than ever after the Paris NATO Council session that they should not expect from the United States or its North Atlantic bloc allies any voluntary renunciation of the course aimed at achieving military supremacy, which is fraught with the danger of a slide toward nuclear war. However the NATO ministers might try to conceal the truth, by demagogic assurances and slander aginst the USSR, they will not succeed. They will not succeed in the primarily because the USSR is proposing a truly just and honest radical reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons; and because, as the ever-growing antinuclear movement convincingly shows, the Europeans understand perfectly that Washington has allotted them the role of nuclear hostages, and they do not wish to accept this role.

'Hypocritical Assurances'

PM130831 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 83 First Edition p 5

[TASS Report: "Speeding Up Militarist Plans"]

[Text] Paris, 12 Jun -- The 2-day NATO Council session of foreign ministers from 16 member countries of this military bloc has ended here.

The session's final communique falls into two parts which contradict each other: The first part, with hypocritical assurances about "the desire for the preservation of peace," is designed to mislead the public and hide a militaristic course aimed at preparations for military confrontation. This is confirmed by the second part of the communique, which expresses support for U.S. plans which aim further to speed up the unchecked arms race and to achieve military superiority over the USSR and Warsaw Pact.

Stating that the deployment of the new U.S. cruise and Pershing -II missiles in Western Europe "will begin at the end of 1983 in accordance with the schedule envisaged in the 1979 decision," the communique's authors give assurances that they are apparently "sincerely striving toward a successful conclusion of the talks" in Geneva. At the same time, they express support for the pseudo-zero and so-called "interim" Reagan proposals which, as is known, cannot serve as a basis for talks, and write off the prospects for achieving a mutually acceptable agreement on nuclear arms limitation in Europe.

Evidence that NATO does not want to conduct constructive talks in Geneva is also contained in the clauses of the communique containing a refusal to count the British and French nuclear weapons in the general European balance of forces, although they are a component part of the NATO arsenal and are aimed at the Warsaw Pact countries.

The communique alternates sweeping statements about an aspiration to support "security on a global scale" with fabrications, mendacious from beginning to end, about a "Soviet military threat." In this way they wish to weaken the vigilance of the public. [TASS International Service in Russian at 1133 GMT on 12 June adds: "... which is protesting against the NATO missile plans."]

The appeal contained in the communique to the USSR "to diplay restraint and responsibility" should have been addressed elsewhere by the participants in the NATO session -- to the United States, their bloc ally, whose irresponsible aggressive policy is threatening international security.

As for the Soviet Union's policy -- its principled, peace-loving foreign policy course, which is directed toward finding a solution for the urgent tasks of limiting and reducing armaments, first and foremost nuclear armaments -- it is clearly set forth in the USSR Government statement of 28 May this year.

The authors of the NATO communique ignore the fact that at all the talks directly or indirectly connected with curbing the arms race, it is the U.S. Administration that is pursuing a nonconstructive, obstructionist line. This is true of U.S. behavior at the talks in Geneva, Vienna and Madrid. The fact that the U.S. stance at the Soviet-U.S. talks on strategic arms limitation and reduction is also wholly oriented not toward honest agreement but toward obtaining unilateral military advantages is shown, too, by the U.S. President's recent statement.

While expatiating about their "striving for peace," the Atlanticists completely gloss over in silence the constructive Soviet proposals and the initiatives of the Warsaw Pact member countries contained in the Prague Declaration and aimed at curbing the arms race and strengthening peace, which were addressed directly to NATO. They refuse to follow the Soviet Union's example in firmly pledging no first use of nuclear weapons and leave unanswered the Warsaw Pact member states' proposals to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of force.

The communique in fact confirms NATO's intention to continue its blatant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states -- the Polish People's Republic and Democratic Afghanistan.

The communique makes it clear that the Atlanticists intend to expand "NATO's activities zone" under the pretext of defending their "common interests." [At this point TASS adds: "These plans are received in the developing countries as a threat of NATO military interference in the internal affairs of states located beyond the bloc's geographic boundaries."] The NATO countries are even trying to dictate to developing countries those principles of "true nonalignment" which, according to the Atlanticists' design, should consolidate the developing countries' political and economic dependence upon the Western world.

At the session the United States made a new attempt to force its alliance partners to reduce their trade and economic links with the states from the socialist community. However, judging from the wording of the communique, Washington has not succeeded in breaking the resistance of its partners in the bloc, who do not intend to act against their own interests and give up their profitable relations of economic cooperation with the socialist countries.

As observers note, the unceremonious attempts made by the United States to "twist arms" have aroused the opposition of a number of delegations. The Greek delegation stated its objections to a whole series of the communique's clauses concerning plans to deploy U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe and the USSR -U.S. talks in Geneva. Denmark introduced reservations, having stated that its parliament had refused to support plans for the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe. Spain also announced reservations: the Spanish government is at the moment considering the whole complex of its relations with NATO.

NATO's dangerous militaristic plans, which have been set out in the session's communique arouse justified concern among the world public, because they lead to a further execerbation of the international situation and arouse justified concern for the future of peace and security.

NATO FUNDS EXPAND U.S. MILITARY IN FAROES

PM101046 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jun 83 First Edition p 3

[V. Voronkov "Notes Apropos": "The Faroes: In NATO's Electronic Tentacles"]

[Excerpts] As the Danish newspaper LAND OG FOLK writes, 130 million kroner have been allocated from NATO funds for the further modernization of military installations on the Faroe Islands. These considerable funds will be spent primarily on expanding the U.S. Merkadal Air Base not far from the archipelago's administrative center -- Torshavn. Powerful espionage radar stations, which, as the newspaper points out, are an important link in NATO's gigantic Nato Air Defense Ground Environment [NADGE] electronic long-range surveillance system covering a tremendous area from Turkey to northern Norway and from Alaska to Greenland, have stretched out their electronic tentacles from here. According to Pentagon doctrine, 24-hour monitoring of air and space as well as issuing U.S. bombers with the definitive order to carry out a nuclear strike in conditions of a so-called "crisis situation" are part of the task of these military communications facilities.

The curtain of mystery and secrecy around U.S. radar installations carefully preserved by NATO was lifted in the book entitled "Greenland -- Pearl of the Ocean" published this year by the Danish Publishing House Ejerene og Forfatierne. In the book, Danish specialists and foreign military experts, on the basis of detailed research, expose the aggressive nature and real purpose of the U.S. bases on the largest island in the world, which like the Faroes is part of Denmark.

NATO mounted the operations to imporove and expand military installations on the Faroe Islands quickly, without waiting for the necessary permission from the municipal authorities and organs of local self-government. The Faroes Government has demanded the removal of U.S. bases from the archipelago several times, but each time it has received a vehement refusal from Denmark.

HARRIMANS ANSWER QUESTIONS ON MOSCOW MEETINGS

PRAVDA Report

PM101603 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 83 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "'It is Important To Embark on a Discussion'"]

[Text] New York, 6 Jun -- The prominent U.S. public and political figures A. and P. Harriman have talked on U.S. television about their conversation in Moscow with CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Yu.V. Andropov.

A. Harriman was asked: Did the meeting make you optimistic? How would you describe the prospects for better relations with the Soviet Union?

He replied: I believe that relations csn be compared to a two-way street. Neither one side nor the other can establish relations by itself. A common goal is necessary and I do not know what our government's position would be. A. Harriman proceeded to urge the U.S. administration not to miss the chance of improving U.S.-Soviet relations. This, he said, would fully accord with U.S. interests.

Obviously we have many differences which we cannot sort out. Therefore I would tackle those problems in relation to which a change for the better is most likely.

The biggest impression we gained from the meeting in the Kremlin, A. Harriman noted, was of the Soviet leader's preoccupation with the present state of Soviet-American relations and his desire to normalize these relations. It was my impression, A. Harriman stressed, that, of the things said to us, this was the most important. It is not for us to change their system. You see, some Americans believe you can sit down at the negotiating table with a Communist and persuade him to change his views, but this is absolutely impossible. You only have to acknowledge that we can live together despite the fact that we have different systems. We can have trade relations. Incidentally, this is one idea I would put forward, perhaps; I mean, expanding trade.

The veteran U.S. diplomat noted that during the conversation the Soviet leader had displayed a willingness to discuss any problems, and his description of the Soviet position was "straightforward and firm." "Yu. V. Andropov made it perfectly clear that the nuclear threat makes war much more dangerous than ever before," A. Harriman said. "He specifically said that such a war posed the threat of much more devastation and demonstrated with the utmost clarity that such a concept as a limited war does not exist."

Answering the question how the present tension could be eased, A. Harriman said: This depends on how far our government is prepared to go. It is important to embark on a discussion. I think that such a discussion would create favorable opportunities, and we must hold talks in spheres where we can make progress.

CBS TV Interview

ID101541 Moscow TASS in English 1027 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] Washington June 10 TASS -- The CBS television company has asked prominent American public figures Averell and Pamela Harriman to share with the television viewers the impressions of their recent meeting in Moscow with Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Answering the question "What do you think Mr. Andropov wants to achieve?" A. Harriman said: "He is very anxious to re-establish reasonable relations between us -- normal relations, as he called it -- and he is very much concerned that if we don't do that, there may be some slip-up. It may be not, he said, somebody do it purposefully, but if we have a mistake made with nuclear weapons, there can be utter disaster, and will be the end of both countries. He wants to do everything he can to avoid that."

Touching upon prospects for a Soviet-American dialogue, Pamela Harriman pointed out that the Soviet Union would very much welcome some way of being able to talk. But at the present moment it is not even getting its messages answered.

Averell Harriman was asked what, in his view, was the future of Soviet-American relations. "I think we have got to begin to talk sooner or later," he answered.

NOVOSTI OBSERVER ON CHANGE IN REAGAN'S 'STYLE'

LD110520 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 10 Jun 83

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] "Style and Essence" is the title of a commentary by Gennadiy Gerasimov, political observer of the NOVOSTI press agency. [shot of Gerasimov at microphone]

Hello, comrades. Recently, even before the conference in Williamsburg, and particularly after the conference, the U.S. President began to speak of his love of peace, his loathing of war, and that he had discovered in himself -- and I quote -- a deep desire to abolish nuclear weapons in the end. If you listen to the manner and substance of what he says now at times, the question arises of whether it is Reagan saying this.

This is what THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote the day before yesterday, for example, on Reagan's latest speech. The tone of the president was extremely conciliatory; it is reported that he is preparing for talks with the Russians. There is also talk of this flexibility. They write that he seems to be serious now in his approach to the talks in Geneva; his approach is serious both to nuclear weapons in Europe and to the limitation and reduction of strategic armaments. Here a puzzling question immediately arises: If Reagan has begun to be serious in his approach to the talks, it means that previously he had not been serious. However, even now seriousness is still a long way off.

But a change in the scenery really is taking place, and there are three reasons for this -- Congress, the electors and the allies. First, the Congress. Reagan has managed to persuade congressmen to support his plan for the creation and deployment of MX, and in return has promised to be serious and flexible at the talks. It would seem as though even the missile itself is necessary for him, not for war, and not for a strategy of deterrence, but for the talks and the guarantee of a position of strength at them.

Second, the electors. The opinion of Joseph Harsch of the paper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR is as follows: He writes that the politically smart dealers surrounding Reagan consider that the warmonger line is a bad policy for Reagan and the Republican Party. Thus, they are changing their masks while on the move, for an election campaign is already on the way.

Third, the allies. At the Williamsburg conference, they were successful in uniting and closing ranks on an anti-Soviet basis. However, the role of leader of the Western World requires one to speak in peace-loving phrases and requires the mantle of peace-maker. Here the reputation of warmonger is a bad reputation and, incidentally, the word warmonger is not my own, but is from the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR.

So those are the three reasons. Among them I did not mention a political about-face, a review of policy, nor is there any. The style has changed, but not the essence. The essence has remained the same -- the MX missiles have remained; the military programs have remained; and the vessels carrying the equipment to Europe for the siting of missiles there have not turned back. Thus the main thing is not the style, but the essence; not words, but deeds.

STATE DEPARTMENT REPORT CALLED 'PROPAGANDA TRICK'

LD100249 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Washington June 9 TASS -- The report of the U.S. Department of State hypocritically entitled "Security and Control Over Armaments: Quest for a More Stable Peace" is yet another propaganda trick of the Reagan administration.

The main aim of that opus is to bring down the wave of strong criticism of the militaristic course of the White House, to neutralize the unprecedented movement of protest in the United States against Washington's military preparations. In an attempt to resolve this task the authors do not disdain to resort to premeditated falsification of facts. They assert without a twinge of conscience that it is the United States but not the USSR which strives to avert the danger of a nuclear war, to ensure genuine peace on the planet, and that allegedly Washington administration put forward all initiatives that led to conclusion of the agreements and accords on control over armaments.

Intimidating the Americans with the mythical "Soviet military threat" the authors of the report are trying to bring it home to them that for the United States it is necessary to continue coming out in the international scene exclusively from the position of strength, and building up nuclear arsenals, thereby justifying American imperialism's insolent claims to global military superiority.

SHULTZ REFLECTS U.S. 'MILITARIST ASPIRATIONS'

LD102053 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] London June 10 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has declared at the NATO Council session in Paris that Washington is "ready to make reasonable bargains" with the Soviet Union in the field of nuclear arms control but only on the condition that USSR will change its position "toward Afghanistan, Poland and other problems".

REUTERS quoted him as saying also that otherwise, the U.S. administration would find it very hard to move forward in discussing other issues, including those in the field of arms control.

Moscow June 10 TASS -- TASS commentator Yu. Logov writes: Shultz made his statement behind closed doors, and it was clearly not intended for the U.S. and West European public which the Reagan administration is trying to convince of its "commitment" to nuclear arms control. The highly-placed U.S. administration official in actual fact admitted in a gust of frankness that the current stalemate at Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva is above all a result of the obstructionist stance of the United States. Shultz's statement shows that the Reagan administration does not only have no desire to discuss the essence of the problem in a businesslike manner, it is devising all kinds of obstacles excluding the possibility of progress. These include both the ill-famed "zero option" designed to secure the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament and its slightly modified "twin" -- the so-called "interim solution" which is patently unacceptable to the USSR for the same reasons. Now Mr. Shultz is putting forward new "conditions" which have nothing to do with efforts to lessen the treat of nuclear catastrophe.

Washington's other words and deeds also indicate its militarist aspirations. Thus, Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger bluntly declared that the main U.S. aim was to deploy from late this year new U.S. missiles in Western Europe. Practical preparations have already got started in Britain, Italy and other NATO countries for the weapons' stationing. Progress at the talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe would frustrate those Pentagon plans since the so-called "two-track" decision adopted by NATO in 1979 provides for the missiles' deployment only if the Soviet-U.S. talks fail. So Washington is now doing everything possible to predetermine the failure of the talks and to site U.S. missiles in Western Europe by any means.

JAPAN'S ANTI-SOVIET CAMPAIGN CRITICIZED

OW110155 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Konstantin Andreyev commentary]

[Text] We will now broadcast a commentary by Radio Moscow's commentator Konstantin Andreyev on the anti-Soviet campaign that is being whipped up in Japan:

Director-General Tanikawa of Japan's Defense Agency will soon visit Hokkaido on a so-called "inspection" of the Soviet territory of the minor Kurile Islands. Lately it has become a trend for Japanese political figures to take such trips. While vigorously encouraged by agitators in the campaign of illegal territorial demands against the Soviet Union, such a trend cannot be said to be without malicious intent. No matter how hard the followers of this trend may attempt to cover up their aims with an "invisible cloak" of public opinion, it is quite obvious that they aim to whip up a propaganda campaign to oppose the Soviet Union, to break the trust between the Soviet Union and Japan, and to aggravate the relations between the two countries.

In the past, successive foreign ministers and directors-general of the prime minister's office as well as other political figures participated in this ugly behavior. This is the first time that the director general of the Defense Agency will undertake a similar so-called inspection trip. This fact is noteworthy by itself.

We do not know when the trend began, but the anti-Soviet campaign in Japan has come to be increasingly linked with the country's militarization policy and has been waged in line with Japan's military policy, as well as with the policies of the United States and the NATO member-states. The Defense Agency chief's tour to Hokkaido indicates that it is no longer possible to conceal who has become the target of the Self-Defense Forces -- one of the prominently powerful armies in post war Asia. The Self-Defense Forces have turned their spearhead primarily toward the Soviet Union.

Usually, the Defense Agency chief will make inspection trips in areas that call for the greatest attention, and it is symbolic that eastern Hokkaido, located closest to the Soviet border, has been selected as the area for inspection this time. Furthermore, the inspection of the Soviet-held islands has been ostentatiously included in the itinerary to underscore the anti-Soviet nature of the tour.

The Soviet Union has never had any intention of launching an attack or imposing any sort of threat on Japan, nor does it have such intentions now. The Soviet Union has done nothing except the minimum that is necessary to ensure its own security. It is the Soviet Union that has made a series of proposals for eliminating the danger of wars in the world, including the Far East. Such proposals have also been offered to Japan, but the Japanese side has never made any positive response. Instead, what have been echoed are bellicose statements concerning the "blockading of straits" and an "unsinkable aircraft carrier," as well as reports on the deployment in Japan of the most advanced American weapons capable of dealing nuclear strikes at Soviet cities.

What naturally follows is the question as to whether such a policy conforms to the interests of the Japanese people themselves. A clear and definite answer to this question is noted in the results of the recent local election in Japan: The Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] suffered a serious defeat in Hokkaido. The ruling circles of Japan have assigned an important role to this island is promoting their anti-Soviet propaganda campaign and plans for a military buildup. However, the people of Hokkaido refused to vote for the LDP candidate for the governorship thus giving a flat answer of "no" to this policy. It appears that this fact itself would have made the Japanese ruling clique seek a more discreet policy, one that conforms to the interests of the people. Nevertheless, Director-General Tanikawa's provocative tour has proved the contrary.

The Japanese leadership has been pursuing a line that will aggravate its relations with the Soviet Union and intensify the tension in the Far East. Such a line runs the risk of causing very serious results, and the Japanese side should be held responsible for such results.

IZVESTIYA ON U.S. STRATEGY IN FAR EAST

PM101413 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by N. Nikolayev: "Asia: Washington's Imperial Ambitions"]

[Text] The present U.S. Administration's policy, which is aimed at stepping up the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, and fueling hostility and distrust among the peoples, is acquiring an increasingly adventurist nature. This course is defined by its overall strategic objectives aimed at the attainment of world hegemony by the United States.

Another target for Washington's imperial ambitions is Asia, where U.S. politicians would like, after Europe, to achieve tangible military-political advantages. The path toward this is seen in the creation of new seats of tension. Special attention is paid to East Asia, which Washington now equates with Europe in terms of its military-strategic importance. The U.S. Armed Forces deployed in this region are described in Pentagon reports as "forward-based forces," that is, just like the troops in West Europe. In both Europe and Asia the United States is seeking to bring its armed forces, including nuclear weapons, closer to the territory of the USSR and its allies, hoping to reduce the time taken to deliver nuclear warheads to targets and, accordingly, on raising the surprise factor of an attack.

Washington does not conceal the fact that it is setting the task of "altering the balance of forces in the Far East in the West's favor." Sophisticated nuclear submarines, the "Ohio" and the "Michigan," equipped with Trident missiles, have been sent to the expanses of the Pacific Ocean. The intention has been announced to supply the ships of the 7th Fleet with Tomahawk cruise missiles. Last fall, with the Japanese Government's full approval, it was decided to deploy U.S. F-16 aircraft, capable of carrying nuclear weapons at Misawa Airbase in northern Honshu. Large-scale maneuvers by U.S. naval forces have become more frequent, and they are of an overtly provocative nature with respect to many countries of this region. The U.S. 7th Fleet aircraft carriers have become frequent "guests" in the Sea of Japan.

The United States has about 150,000 servicemen and over 300 establishments in the Pacific area, including very large naval and air bases in Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines. Nonetheless, in the opinion of the Reagan administation, in contrast to Europe where the United States relies on NATO, the Far East flank is as yet "not firm enough." That is why, alongside the buildup of its own armaments in the Far East, the United States is seeking to ensure that military preparations are stepped up by the Asian states linked to it by treaty commitments.

"Unsinkable Aircraft Carrier"

Special emphasis is placed on the development of military-political cooperation with Japan and on the more active and specific involvement of its economic and strengthening military potential in the global strategy of U.S. imperialism, which greatly impresses the Japanese "hawks."

During his recent visit to the United States, Prime Minister Y. Nakasone stressed that Japan must be a militarily strong state -- an "unsinkable aircraft carrier" capable of offering resistance to Soviet aircraft, controlling the straits used by the Soviet Navy as an outlet from the Sea of Japan to the Pacific, and, finally, exercising control over sea routes over a radius of 1,000 miles from Japanese shores.

If the United States is seeking global hegemony, its Japanese partner is stating increasingly frankly its claims to be the regional ruler in Southeast Asia. Evidence of this can be found in the Japanese prime minister's recent tour of the ASEAN countries during which Tokyo tried to present itself as an unsolicited "expresser" and even "defender" of the Asian countries' interests.

Counting on acquiring additional military-strategic positions as in West Europe, Washington is on the one hand encouraging Tokyo's escalationist aspirations in Southeast Asia and on the other, as the Indonesian newspaper BERITA YUDHA put it, it is pushing the ASEAN states into Japan's embraces against the USSR. In Indonesia the opinion is being voiced that, despite Nakasone's statements, Japan will soon try to include the Straits of Malacca and other strategic straits of the region in its naval forces' patrol zone. This course is naturally causing growing anxiety among the peoples of Southeast Asia who have not forgotten the crimes of Japanese militarism during World War II.

The activation of Japan's role in the Japanese-U.S. military-political alliance and the expansion of its contribution to "joint defense with the United States" are evidence that Tokyo is beginning to play increasingly clearly the role of NATO's Far Eastern flank. As the Japanese press has stated, by signing the statement on nuclear weapons issues at the conference in Williamsburg, "Japan has in fact stated its complete cooperation in implementing NATO strategy," confirming the course Tokyo adopted at the same time toward the country's militarization. By linking itself to NATO strategy the Japanese government is taking a step in a risky direction: it is drawing the country into pursuing an extremely dangerous policy which has nothing in common with safeguarding security and national interests.

The statement made by the Soviets to the Japanese Government on 4 February this year gives a principled assessment of the line toward the marked activation of Japan's military preparations and the expansion of its military-strategic cooperation with the United States. It stresses that states neighboring Japan cannot fail to draw the appropriate conclusions from the fact that there has been a sharp intensification of military tendencies in the Japanese government's policy, and they will be obliged to take corresponding steps to safeguard their own security.

In an attempt to achieve military-strategic superiority in the Asian and Pacific region, the United States also views South Korea, in addition to Japan, as a "forward base." The White House is obviously interested in preserving tension on the Korean peninsula and creating one more bridgehead of nuclear aggression here.

The United States is preserving its military cooperation with Taiwan and continuing to supply it with combat equipment. As the Chinese political weekly BEIJING REVIEW wrote recently, Washington "has in fact abandoned the pursuit of the policy of 'two Chinas' or 'one China and one Taiwan,' viewing that island as 'an unsinkable aircraft carrier.'" Although, for understandable reasons, the fact is not publicized, according to the Washington strategists' designs, Taiwan is an important link between the U.S. bases in Japan and the Philippines and lends "additional strength" to the "geometrical figure" which is being constructed around Washington, Tokyo, Seoul, and Taipei.

Using economic and military levers of pressure, Washington is trying to push the ASEAN states onto the path of confrontation with the Indochina states and is seeking to turn ASEAN into a sort of military-political formation serving U.S. interests.

Search for "Hostages"

In deploying nuclear arms, including first-strike weapons, at its bases in Asia, the United States is reproducing the "European option." It is counting on a retaliatory strike being diffused and falling mainly on countries where U.S. nuclear weapons are deployed, while the United States itself escapes with minimal damage. Essentially Washington is trying to turn the Asian countries, on whose territory the U.S. has military establishments, into "hostages" of its policy, assigning them the dubious honor of becoming a "theater of military operations" in the very first stages of a nuclear war. The United States tries to conceal its hegemonist designs by references to the mythical "Soviet threat" and the Soviet Union's alleged "buildup of its armaments in its Far Eastern regions," SS-20 missiles included.

The USSR has not threatened and does not threaten anyone -- neither in Europe or Asia, nor other parts of the world -- and it does nothing over and above what is absolutely necessary from the viewpoint of safeguarding its security. In the eastern part of its territory it has the right to have just as many armaments, including medium-range nuclear missile weapons, as are necessary to counter the nuclear missile weapons targeted on it from the Asian and Pacific zone. Yet at the Geneva talks the U.S. spokesmen are trying to make an issue of this seemingly clear question.

Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed: "The violation of universally accepted norms for conducting talks and the reluctance to work toward a mutually acceptable accord are also manifested in the fact that the U.S. Administration is trying to disarm us unilaterally not only in the West, in Europe, but also in the East, in Asia. Washington would like to dictate its own terms to us -- that we do not deploy our medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union. This, of course, is totally outside the framework of the Geneva talks. The Americans keep quiet about the fact that they have concentrated numerous nuclear weapons against us in Asia, the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and the Far East." But the USSR will never be unarmed in the face of any threat, wherever it may come from.

The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that in the present complex international situation it is essential immediately, and this applies fully to the Asian region too, to double, to treble efforts aimed at countering the policy of preparing for war and at limiting the arms race and strengthening mutual trust. Peace is indivisible. It is a manifestation of profound responsibility for the destiny of peace which dictated the Soviet Union's pledge to renounce first use of nuclear weapons. The proposal made by the USSR to the NATO countries, in conjunction with the other Warsaw Pact states, to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of force and the maintenance of relations of peace,provides for the possibility of any state acceding to it, irrespective of its geographical location. The Soviet initiatives aimed at restricting the actions of military fleets and extending confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans, and particularly to those regions through which busy maritime routes pass, have a direct bearing on the Asian and Pacific regions.

The proposal put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress for holding talks on confidence-building measures in the Far East retains its topicality. Here the Soviet Union is prepared for such measures -- on both a multilateral and a bilateral basis -- with all countries really interested in taking specific steps to create an atmosphere of trust in both the political and military fields and to normalize the situation in the region. This approach opens up prospects for easing tension in the Far East and Southeast Asia and is the only sensible and effective alternative to the militarist U.S. course. The Soviet Union is fully determined to continue to wage a persistent struggle to safeguard lasting peace in the Far East and Southeast Asia and to develop in this region, as in other parts of the world, relations of genuine good-neighborliness and mutually advantageous cooperation.

PAKISTANI FOREIGN MINISTER VISITS MOSCOW

Yaqub Khan Arrives

LD091252 Moscow TASS in English 1230 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS -- Pakistani Foreign Minister Yaqub Khan has arrived in Moscow today on a short working visit.

He was met at the airport by Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and other officials.

Iftikhar Ali, ambassador of Pakistan to the USSR, was also at the airport.

Gromyko, Khan Discuss DRA

PM130935 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1010 GMT 12 Jun 83 First Edition p 4

[Text] Talks were held in the Kremlin on 10 June between Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and minister of foreign affairs, and Yaqub Khan, Pakistani minister of foreign affairs, who has arrived in Moscow for a brief business visit.

They exchanged views on a number of topical international problems which are of mutual interest to the Soviet Union and Pakistan as well as on some matters of Soviet-Pakistani relations. Special attention was given to the problem of a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

Andrey Gromyko positively assessed the fact that talks on questions of a political settlement between Afghanistan and Pakistan will be resumed in Geneva in the middle of June through a personal envoy of the UN secretary general. At the same time, he emphasized that a political settlement is possible only on the basis of complete termination of armed and other interference from the oustside in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. An important role in eliminating tension around this independent nonaligned state can and must be played precisely by Pakistan from where armed incursions into Afghanistan are made.

It was pointed out that a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan would also make for the improvement of the situation in Southwest Asia as a whole, and for the normalization of Pakistan's relations with its neighbors. This would create more favorable conditions for the development of Soviet-Pakistani relations in various fields. Yaqub Khan set out Pakistan's stand on this and other matters.

On the same day Andrey Gromyko gave a luncheon in honor of Yaqub Khan, Pakistani minister of foreign affairs. During the luncheon the two ministers exchanged brief toasts.

Pakistani Foreign Minister Yaqub Khan, who was in our country on a brief business visit, departed Moscow 10 June. At the airport he was seen off by G.M. Korniyenko, USSR first deputy foreign minister, and other officials. Pakistan's ambassador to the USSR, Iftikhar Ali, was among the sendoff party.

Talks, Lunch Speeches Noted

BK101754 Karachi Domestic Service in English 1700 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] The foreign minister, Sahabzada Yaqub Khan, had a 3-hour meeting without aides with the Soviet foreign minister, Mr Gromyko, in Moscow today. Their discussions, which covered matters of mutual interest, included the problem of Afghanistan, with particular reference to the indirect negotiations being conducted through the intermediary of the personal representative of the United Nations secretary general which are to be resumed in Geneva on Thursday.

Later, the Soviet delegation headed by Mr Gromyko, and the Pakistan delegation headed by Sahabzada Yaqub Khan, held talks in the afternoon. Various views were exchanged on major international issues. Mr Gromyko was assisted, among others, by the first deputy foreign minister, Mr Korniyenko, while the Pakistan side included Ambassador Mr Iftikhar Ali and members of the Pakistan delegation.

The Soviet foreign minister also hosted a lunch in honor of his Pakistani guests which was attended, among others, by the (?first) soviet deputy foreign minister. Speaking on the occasion, Mr Gromyko characterized Pakistan-Soviet relations as good and spoke of convergence of views on a number of international issues. He expressed the hope that bilateral relations will be further strengthened.

Sahabzada Yaqub Khan, reciprocating the sentiments, referred to the significant economic cooperation that existed between the two countries and the steps being taken to further increase cooperation in various fields. [The] foreign minister expressed deep appreciation for the warm hospitality shown to him and extended an invitation to Mr Gromyko to visit Pakistan. Sahabzada Yaqub Khan also conveyed a message of greetings from President Mohammad Ziaul Haq to the Soviet leader, Mr Andropov. Mr Gromyko, in return, asked the Pakistan foreign minister to convey greetings from Andropov to the Pakistan president.

Sahabzada Yaqub Khan is due to leave Moscow for home tonight.

IZVESTIYA ARTICLE CRITICIZES 'LIES' ABOUT DRA

PM091431 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 5

[V. Svetozarov article: "The Vicious Circle of Lies"]

[Text] An article published by THE WASHINGTON POST 31 May under J. Anderson's byline surpasses in falsity perhaps everything else that has been invented by the U.S. press on the subject of Democratic Afghanistan. It appears to the author that official U.S. circles "understate" the scale of "violations of human rights by the Soviet Union" in Afghanistan. He has hastened to bridge the "gap," quoting several "reports" which perhaps originated in an imagination stretched to its limits.

Let us start with the fact that U.S. Government departments have no intention of applying the brakes to the conveyor belt they have set in motion to manufacture false "reports" about Afghanistan. This has been proved by President Reagan's loud proclamation of the so-called "Afghanistan Days," which were held with pomp. It has been proved by the State Department's recent release of a number of slanderous statements about "large-scale combat operations" by Soviet and Afghan troops in Herat, which have reportedly caused enormous "damage" to the city and its population. Yet another slander has again failed ignominiously. A group of foreign journalists was in Herat on those days. They failed to detect either the "barbaric bombing" or the more than "1,000 victims." The ancient city met them with its usual measured labor life whose peaceful flow is, from time to time, broken by the gangster-like sallies of the counterrevolution. The fable invented deep inside the U.S. foreign policy department was also refuted officially in a declaration by Afghanistan's BAKHTAR news agency.

It would seem that there are good reasons why the confused champions of "human rights" should hold their tongues. But no! There have emerged followers of the Geobbels propaganda principle: The more absurd and monstrous the lie, the better. Furthermore, they borrow not just principles, but also theses from the Nazis. J. Anderson's anti-Soviet rage has led to disgusting and blasphemous accusations against the Soviet Army of "brutalities toward Germany's civil population at the end of World War II."

Without hesitation, Anderson perpetrates yet another forgery -- he takes under his wings the Afghans who are "overflowing with determination to resist," naturally, against the people's rule. He is talking about those whom U.S. propaganda proclaims to be "freedom fighters" trained by U.S. and other instructors in the crafts of killing and sabotage, and who are then sent over to Afghanistan's territory to sow death and destruction wherever they go. I will quote a few facts from the bloody annals of their actions.

On the evening of 5 January this year gangsters exploded 10 mines in one of Herat's residential districts, resulting in the injury of several peaceful inhabitants. On the evening of 23 January counterrevolutionaries fired on a private car in Herat Province killing a woman and a child. In the same province, on 13 February, "freedom fighters" fired grenade launchers on a bus carrying workers from a textile factory and several passengers were killed or injured. Gangsters attacked the mosque in (Chitguarkhan) settlement, Jowzjan Province, and brutally settled accounts with Mullah Muhammad. On 13 February a gang of bandits executed 32 inhabitants of (Karayachag) settlement, Samangan Province, for being loyal to the local authorities. In Laghman Province gangsters attacked, on 10 January, a group of schoolchildren from (Kalikhund) settlement, beat them up, tore up their books, and threatened them with death if they continued their studies. On 31 January, in Kabul, counterrevolutionaries broke into the home of the Bank of Afghanistan official Nasrullah Wali Muhammad, killed the householder, his teenage daughter, and young son, and gravely injured his other daughter. In the city of Mazar-e-Sharif on 11 February a group of counterrevolutionary elements carried out an attack against a leather goods warehouse and stole over 1.5 million afghanis from the safe. On 8 March in Takhar Province gangsters broke into the home of local activist Bahr ad-Din in his absence and executed his entire family: wife, mother, and five children.

Unlike THE WASHINGTON POST'S "reports," these are true facts, just a fraction of the crimes by mercenary killers inspired by U.S. support. The official U.S. spokesmen and the bourgeois press, which prides itself on its supposed "objectivity," prefer to keep silent about such "exploits." On the other hand, they spare neither words nor paper for blackening Afghanistan's democratic system and for slandering the Soviet assistance to the friendly southern neighbor.

It may be that it would not be worth paying attention to THE WASHINGTON POST's daubs had it not been for a single coincidence. Nowadays Afghanistan's and Pakistan's foreign ministers are preparing to resume the Geneva talks through the mediation of the UN secretary general's representative D. Cordoves. Judging by statements by the sides participating in the talks, which are meant to advance the political settlement of problems around Afghanistan, there has been some progress at them. Such a development of events is not to the United States' liking.

The Western press recently reported the Reagan administration's decision to significantly increase both the quality and the quantity of military aid to Afghan counter-revolutionary organizations, including the expansion of deliveries of bazookas, mortars, grenade launchers, antiaircraft guns, recoilless rifles, and rocketry. The escalation of armed interference is supplemented by and combined with growing subversibe propaganda against Afghanistan and the Soviet Union. The goal of the unbridled slander campaign is obvious: to fan anti-Afghan and anti-Soviet passions, poison the atmosphere at the talks, and exert pressure on Pakistan.

This is the unseemly and unscrupulous game played by the completely inveterate liar J. Anderson and THE WASHINGTON POST editors who are not fastidious in the choice of their means. I do not know whether any of them have ever been to Afghanistan, but I would remind them of the popular Afghan proverb: "You can't block out the sun with the palm of your hand." A wise saying. Lies really are short-lived!

USSR-DRA RADIO, TELEVISION AGREEMENT SIGNED

LD032012 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 3 Jun 83

[Text] Kabul June 3 TASS -- An agreement on Afghan-Soviet cooperation in the field of radio and television has been signed in Kabul. Under the agreement the Soviet Union will render assistance to the DRA in the construction of three TV studios as well as in the reconstruction of radio and television studios which broadcast reports on various aspects of the country's socio-economic life.

Speaking at the agreement-signing ceremony, Dr Haydar Masud, president of the state radio and television of the DRA, expressed heartfelt gratitude to the Soviet Union for the unselfish fraternal assistance being rendered to the DRA in various fields. He emphasized that the agreement is another illustration of fraternal friendship and unselfish cooperation between the two countries.

BRIEFS

DRA GROUP DEPARTS UZBEKISTAN -- A group of Afghan representatives headed by Abdol Galeb Jam, director of the DRA Council of Ministers Board of Muslim Affairs, departed Tashkent for Kabul on 1 June. Mufti Shamseddin Khan ibn Ziauddin Khan ibn Ishan Babakhan, head of the Muslim Board of Central Asia and the Kazakh SSR, gave a reception in honor of the esteemed guests from the friendly country. The reception was attended by renown spiritual scholars, imams and preachers from the mosques in Tashkent, and the teachers of the capital's higher Islamic institute known as Imam Isma'il Al-Bukhari. In a statement to our correspondent, Abdol Galeb Jam said: We are confident that faith is being respected in the Soviet Union. The members of the society of Muslims are satisfied with the (?behavior) of the Soviet peoples and they are unwavering strugglers for peace. Our representatives will definitely be telling the Afghan people about the things they have seen here. [Text] [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 1 Jun 83 GF]

KOIVISTO, DELEGATION WRAP UP USSR VISIT

Cooperation Program Details

PM091440 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Developing Cooperation"]

[Text] A program for cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and Finland in 1983-87 was signed 7 June in Moscow.

It is planned to further develop links in the spheres of culture, the arts, cinematography, television and radio broadcasting, publishing work, sports, tourism and in the various sectors of science and education, including the study of the Russian language in Finland and of the Finnish language in the USSR. In addition, there will be exchanges along the lines of creative unions and public organizations -- trade unions, young people's, women's, and others -- as well as contacts between Soviet and Finnish cities.

The document was signed by M.S. Kapitsa, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, and M. Tuvonen, Finland's secretary of state for foreign affairs.

Patolichev-Laine Meeting

PM101201 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In the Interests of Cooperation"]

[Text] N.S. Patolichev, USSR minister of foreign trade, met J. Laine, Finnish minister of foreign trade, on 8 June.

They discussed questions connected with the state of and prospects for the further development of trade and economic cooperation between the two countries.

Arrives in Kiev

AU090944 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 0400 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Summary] "On 8 June, Mauno Koivisto, president of the Republic of Finland, arrived in the capital city of the Soviet Ukraine. At Borispol Airport, the president of the Finnish Republic was welcomed by Shecherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary; and Vatchenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman." The welcoming party also included Merkulov, department chief in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; Martynenko, Ukrainian foreign affairs minister; Zgurskiy, Kiev Gorispolkom chairman; and other officials.

"The state flags of Finland, the USSR, and the Ukrainian SSR were hoisted in the airport. Young women in national dresses offered flowers to the guests. Mauno Koivisto was warmly welcomed by representatives of the Kiev working people."

Along the route of the motorcade to the city, there were the state flags of Finland, the USSR, and the Ukrainian SSR, as well as welcoming slogans in the Finnish, Russian, and Ukrainian languages.

Mauno Koivisto visited the Park of Eternal Glory and laid a wreath on the tomb of the unknown soldier.

"Yesterday, Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, met the president of the Finnish Republic, Mauno Koivisto." Participating in the meeting were Vatchenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Council of Ministers chairman; and other officials.

"In the conversation, which was held in a friendly atmosphere, the importance was noted of the talks held in Moscow by Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium member, and by other Soviet leaders with Koivisto for further developing the relations of good neighborhood and friendship between the Soviet Union and Finland, and for consolidating peace and international security. Deep satisfaction was expressed with the protocol signed between the Soviet Union and Finland" on extending the 1948 treaty.

"Comrade Shcherbitskiy gave an account of the republic's achievements in economic, scientific, and cultural development, of the progress made in fulfilling the 11th 5-Year Plan, and of the part of the Ukrainian SSR in Soviet-Finnish economic, scientific-technical, and cultural cooperation.

"Mauno Koivisto expressed thanks for the warm and (?friendly) reception. He noted that the present visit to the Soviet Union continued the traditions developing in Finland's relations with the USSR for many years" and emphasized "mutual respect existing between our countries and peoples."

"Participating in the conversation were Masol, Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman and Gosplan chairman; Merkulov, department chief in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; Martynenko, Ukrainian foreign affairs minister; Sobolev, USSR ambassador to Finland; Platonov, Scandinavian Countries Department Chief in the USSR Foreign Affairs Ministry; Karhila, Finnish ambassador to the USSR; (Kersonen), chief of the President's office; (Kahla), assistant to the president; and [name indistinct], Press Department chief in the Finnish Foreign Affairs Ministry."

Tours Kiev; Attends Dinner

LD092019 Moscow TASS in English 1935 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Kiev June 9 TASS -- President Mauno Koivisto of Finland is in Kiev, the capital of the Soviet Ukraine, for the second day. He is staying in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government.

Mauno Koivisto today saw the places of interest in Kiev. He visited the memorial complex "Ukrainian State Museum of History of Great Patriotic War 1941-1945," saw new housing developments, and historical and architectural monuments. The guest also visited the Paton Institute of Electric Welding at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.

The presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine and the republic's government gave a dinner in honour of the head of the friendly state. Aleksey Vatchenko, vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Mauno Koivisto exchanged speeches at the dinner.

Present at the dinner was Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine.

Leaves Kiev for Home

LD101114 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] Kiev June 10 TASS -- Having completed his tour of the Soviet Union, Finland's President Mauno Koivisto has today left Kiev for home. He was paying an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government.

At the airport, bedecked with the state flags of Finland, the Soviet Union and the Soviet Ukraine, Mauno Koivisto was seen off by Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine; Aleksey Vatchenko, deputy president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Nikolay Talyzin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR; Aleksandr Lyashko, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukraine; Vladimir Sobolev, ambassador of the USSR to Finland; Vladimir Martynenko, minister of foreign affairs of the Ukraine; and other officials.

There also was at the airport Aarno Karhilo, Finland's ambassador to the USSR.

Joint Communique Released

PM111700 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 83 First Edition pp 1, 4

["Soviet-Finnish Statement" on 6-10 June USSR visit by Finnish President Mauno Koivisto]

[Text] At the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government, Mauno Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic, was in the Soviet Union on an official visit 6-10 June 1983.

The president of the Finnish Republic and the persons accompanying him visited Moscow and Kiev. Everywhere the high-ranking guest and persons accompanying him were given a warm and cordial welcome.

The Finnish head of state laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall.

Talks were held during the visit, in which [the] following took part:

On the Soviet side: Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR minister of foreign affairs; V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; P.S. Patolichev, USSR Minister of Foreign Trade; and M. Sobolev, USSR ambassador to Finland.

On the finnish side: M. Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic; and also Prime Minister K. Sorsa; Foreign Minister P. Vayrynen; Foreign Trade Minister J. Laine; and Finnish Ambassador to the USSR A. Karhila.

The meetings and talks proceeded in the atmosphere of friendship and mutual confidence that is traditional in Soviet-Finnish relations. They showed convincingly once again that solid mutual understanding and readiness to continue developing cooperation in the interests of both couuntries' peoples and of the cause of world peace exist between the USSR and Finland.

I.

Comprehensively examining questions relating to the state of and prospects for the development of Soviet-Finnish relations, the sides expressed satisfaction with the high level and effectiveness of the multifaceted cooperation and extensive system of mutually advantageous ties between the two countries. Soviet-Finnish relations, which develop without regard to fluctuations in the international situation, are built to the mutual advantage of the two countries' peoples, observing the principles of equality, mutual respect, sovereignty, and noninterference in one another's internal affairs. They are an example of the implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems and accord fully with the aims and principles of the UN Charter and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The unshakable foundation of relations between the Soviet Union and Finland is the treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance signed in 1948. The conclusion of the treaty is indissolubly linked with the mainstream direction of the development of relations between the two countries, whose basis was laid by the decree on the recognition of Finland's state independence signed by V.I. Lenin.

The experience of the treaty's operation over three and a half decades has shown convincingly its historical worth and lasting significance for mutual relations between the Soviet and Finnish peoples. The conviction was expressed that this document has been and remains, in all its provisions and principles, a firm foundation for the development of fruitful ties and multifaceted cooperation between the two countries for many years to come. The treaty plays an important role in ensuring the security of Finland and of the USSR's northwestern borders. It is an effective factor in strengthening peace and stability in northern Europe, it accords with the aims of security and cooperation on the European Continuent, and it serves the cause of international detente.

Inspired by the sincere desire to strengthen and further develop friendly, good-neighborly relations between the two countries, the sides decided to extend ahead of time the term of the treaty's operation, in unaltered form, for the next 20 years, and they signed an appropriate protocol to that effect. The signing of this document expresses at the same time the Soviet Union and Finland's desire to contribute to the strengthening of peace and security.

The sides noted once again that, being based on the treaty, Finland's foreign policy course -- the "Paasikivi-Kekkonen line" -- guarantees the steady development of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union and expresses Finland's desire to pursue a peace-loving neutral policy in the interests of international peace and security and to maintain friendly relations with all countries. In this connection President M. Koivisto stressed that Finland will purposefully and invariably follow this line, defined by Presidents J.K. Paasikivi and U. Kekkonen, in which the maintenance and all-around development of friendly relations with the Soviet Union occupies a central place. For their part the Soviet leaders stated that the USSR greatly appreciates Finland's foreign policy course -- the "Paasikivi-Kekkonen line" -- and the atmosphere of confidence and mutual understanding established between the two countries

II.

The Soviet and Finnish sides expressed satisfaction with the state of trade-economic and scientific-technical ties between the USSR and Finland. They stressed the paramount significance for these ties of the long-term program for developing and deepening trade-economic, industrial, and scientific-technical cooperation.

The sides stated their intention to continue mutually advantageous trade at a high level and on a balanced basis, in accordance with the interests and requirements of the two countries' economies. By expanding trade exchange using the clearing [kliringovyy] system of accounting, they will continue to improve the structure of reciprocal deliveries by means of diversification. Within the framework of the standing Soviet-Finnish Intergovernmental Commission on Economic Cooperation, the drawing up of an agrement on trade turnover and payments for 1986-90 and a protocol on clarifying and extending the terms of operation of the long-term program to the year 2000 has been initiated. The sides see it as an important task for the commission to further develop new forms of trade-economic cooperation, with primarily the expansion of Finnish imports from the Soviet Union in mind.

During the visit a protocol was signed on cooperation in the sphere of agriculture and foodstuffs production for the period to 1990.

Taking into consideration the great significance for reciprocal trade of the traditional deliveries of energy sources from the Soviet Union, the sides will continue to study questions relating to the expansion of cooperation in various sectors of the power industry. In the very near future they will embark, in particular on talks concerning joint clarification of the potential for a significant increase in deliveries of Soviet natural gas and the continuation of the construction of a gas pipeline on Finnish territory for this prupose.

The sides will continue to contribute to the joint construction of industrial and other projects on the territory of Finland and the Soviet Union. They paid particular attention to the implementation of joint plans on the territory of Finland.

Together with the existing forms of cooperation in this sphere, the sides will study ways of expanding it by creating industrial enterprises on a barter basis, with the development of production collaboration also in mind. The role of such collaboration was noted as an effective means of increasing and diversifying reciprocal trade.

Both sides attach great importance to the development of ties and exchanges in the spheres of culture, science, education, tourism and sports. They will continue to strive for the expansion of existing ties and cooperation between social organizations. In this connection a high assessment was given of the vigorous activity of the "USSR-Finland" and "Finland-Soviet Union" societies in the matter of strengthening mutual understanding and mutual acquaintance between the two states' peoples, and the readiness was reaffirmed to continue giving support to the valuable work of these societies as well as other social organizations.

The sides stated their determination to protect everything that has been achieved in relations between the two countries and to seek new opportunities for developing mutual cooperation for the benefit of the Soviet and Finnish peoples.

III.

The Soviet Union and Finland expressed profound concern about the continuing growth of tension in the world, the undermining of international confidence, the stepping up of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and the growing danger of nuclear conflict. They are united in the belief that there is no more important task at the present time than the prevention of nuclear war.

The participants in the talks believe that all states, both great and small, must demonstrate political will and combine efforts to return interstate relations to the channel of detente and constructive cooperation, [and that they must show] readiness to seek solutions to contentious problems through honest and equitable talks. The Soviet Union and Finland will contribute to the achievement of these aims.

Both sides firmly advocate curbing the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, and implementing effective measures in the direction of universal and complete disarmament under effective international control. The committement unilaterally adopted by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is a convincing example of its concern to consolidate peace and its desire to avert nuclear disaster.

The sides stressed the importance of reaching specific understandings on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security at the Soviet-American talks being conducted in Geneva on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe and on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms.

The Soviet side explained the substance of the initiatives of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact states aimed at halting the arms race, eliminating the threat of nuclear war, and continuing and deepening detente on the European Continent. Particular attention was drawn here to the proposal on concluding a treaty open to all countries on mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact and North Atlantic Treaty member states. It was stressed on the Soviet Union's side that implementation of this proposal would accord fully with the decision of the states which took part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to discharge, by all means and in all forms they deem appropriate, the commitment to refrain from threatening or using force in relations with one another.

The Finnish side observed that the normalization of the international situation would be assisted by the holding of constructive dialogue, on the basis of the initiatives indicated and at a level and in forms acceptable to all sides, regarding means by which any use of military force could be averted in relations between states.

The sides are convinced that the reaching of agreement on a complete and universal ban on nuclear weapon tests would contribute significantly to curbing the nuclear arms race. The extreme importance of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the need for a further strengthening of the regime defined by it were stressed here. Curbing the nuclear arms race would also help to expand international cooperation in the sphere of the utilization of nuclear power for peaceful purposes.

The need was stressed to draw up an agreement on banning and eliminating stocks of chemical weapons, to conclude an international treaty banning the deployment of any types of weapons in space, and to achieve the speediest concrete results at the talks in progress in Vienna on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe on the basis of the principle of no deteriment to the security of any of the sides.

The sides are utterly determined to assist the continuation of the process begun in Helsinki of strengthening security and developing cooperation in Europe. It was emphasized that observance and implementation of all the provisions and principles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe are of exceptional importance for the development of friendly ties and peaceful cooperation among the states which took part in the conference. The consistent implementation of the Final Act is making and will indeed continue in the future to make a useful contribution to ensuring the whole process of international detente and to make it increasingly viable and comprehensive.

The Soviet Union and Finland reaffirmed their invariable desire to actively assist the preservation and consolidation of peace and stability in northern Europe and the Baltic region. They stressed that the paths to strengthening the security of northern Europe lie not through the stepping up of military activity but through the expansion of all-around, mutually advantageous cooperation and a joint search for solutions which ensure that the region remains outside the sphere of tension and conflicts.

In this connection the importance and urgency were again noted of the proposals advanced by Finland for declaring northern Europe a nuclear-free zone and ensuring lasting peace in that region. The sides expressed the opinion that the implementation of the nuclear-free zone proposal would reflect extremely positively on the northern European countries' security and would favorably influence the situation in Europe as a whole.

Reaffirming its wish to assist the implementation of the Finnish proposal, the Soviet side declared the USSR's readiness to act as guarantor of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe and to examine the question of some measures in relation to its own adjacent territory.

The Finnish side expressed satisfaction with the constructive character of the Soviet side's observations on the above question and with its readiness to assist the creation of favorable conditions for the implementation of the zone proposal.

The sides noted that centers of tension continue to persist in various regions of the world. They favored the elimination of existing centers of tension and the prevention of the emergence of new ones. In their opinion, there are no existing world or regional problems that cannot be resolved by political means, by means of talks in accordance with the UN Charter.

The Soviet Union and Finland attach great importance to further strengthening the role of the United Nations as a collective instrument for maintaining international peace and security and developing peaceful cooperation and to increasing its effectiveness on the basis of strict observance of the UN Charter -- the unshakable foundation of all its activity.

IV.

The meetings and talks held during the visit are renewed evidence of the great importance to the development of ties between the two countries of the personal contacts between the leaders of the Soviet Union and Finland which have become a valuable tradition. The maintenance and continued implementation of this established practice give new impetus to the multifaceted development of Soviet-Finnish relations. The sides favored consistent continuation of these contacts and meetings.

Both sides stated their desire to continue the established contacts at government level, between the parliaments and the foreign ministries, and also between other official institutions in the two countries.

The Soviet and Finnish sides expressed profound satisfaction with the results of the official visit to the Soviet Union by M. Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic. They are convinced that the visit, the fruitful talks held, the new extension ahead of time of the term of the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance, and the signing of the other documents constitute a major milestone in Soviet-Finnish relations and will contribute to the further development of friendship, confidence and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Finland in the interests of the two countries' peoples and to the benefit of world peace.

M. Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic, extended an invitation to Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to pay an official visit to Finland. The invitation was accepted with thanks.

MOSCOW OBSERVER ON UK ELECTION IMPLICATIONS

LD110446 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1835 GMT 10 Jun 83

[From "The World Today" Program Presented by Political Observer Vladimir Dunayev]

[Text] Much is now being written and said everywhere about the election in Britain, not because the Conservative victory -- they won the election, as you, of course, already know -- is unexpected. Much is being said and written because, so to speak, an explanation is being sought: Why was Margaret Thatcher able to remain in power for another 5 years?

At times even the strangest of explanations are offered. An American commentator considers that everything hung on transatlantic assistance for Margaret Thatcher. At the beginning of the election campaign Margaret Thatcher specially invited Gordon Rees, a charm consultant from Los Angeles in California. He advised the prime minister to change her hairstyle and restock her wardrobe, and this was done. If the U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK is to be believed, Margaret Thatcher even decided to have some painful and unpleasant treatment to straighten her teeth. After this her electoral smile was flawless. That is one explanation which is being given.

In my first program I already spoke about this, and tried to give reasons for, in my opinion, this somewhat paradoxical event: In spite of enormous unemployment and the economic blind alley into which she has led Britain, Margaret Thatcher and her government nonetheless succeeded in returning to power.

I will not repeat myself. Instead we will discuss what happens now and what is to come. The news agencies are now reporting that evidently Margaret Thatcher will conduct a reorganization of her Conservative government, and get rid of ministers who are not wholly obedient, now that she is, so to speak, in the saddle after the election. In particular it is said that Whitelaw and Pym, two prominent Conservative ministers, will be removed from the Cabinet. It is also reported that Michael Foot, the leader of the Labour Party, after this failure, may now have to resign and the matter of who will replace him is being discussed. Such is the speculation.

But what about the essence of the matter? In essence a government of big business will remain in office, and of course, in the internal political and social spheres the prospects are hardly comforting for the working people of Britain.

In foreign policy much will depend on the extent to which the interests of British capital coincide with those of the U.S. military-industrial complex, in specific problems. These interests, incidentally, are certainly not bound to coincide on every question. There is also rivalry and serious differences, as was clear during the U.S.-West European confrontation, so to speak, or argument, if you like, over the gas-pipe project. [sentence indistinct] So we shall wait and see.

MOSCOW CONDEMNS EGYPTIAN MINISTER'S STAND

LD111707 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 11 Jun 83

[From "Window on the Arab World" program prepared by Vladimir Bilyakov]

[Text] In the first commentary of our program today we said that unity is an important weapon in the hands of the Arabs. The other factor which would consolidate the Arab position in face of the American-Israeli collusion is cooperation with the influential international powers that support the Arab cause, headed by the Soviet Union. True Arab patriots realize the importance of such cooperation. Indicative of this fact are the treaties of friendship and cooperation which have been concluded between the Soviet Union on the one hand and Iraq, the PDRY, and Syria on the other. An agreement in principle has been reached on the conclusion of a similar treaty with the Libyan Jamahiriyah. Our country has firm and cordial relations with the PLO, Algeria, the YAR, and a number of other Arab countries.

The importance of Soviet-Arab cooperation is also realized by the enemies of the Arabs. Consequently, this cooperation has become a target for the fiercest attacks by imperialist and Zionist circles which seek to lower the reputation of the Soviet Union in the eyes of the Arabs and to distort its policy.

We see Egyptian Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali has joined this campaign. His statement to the Egyptian weekly AL-MUSWWAR is full of unfriendly attacks on the Soviet Union and of uncouth attempts to lower the reputation of its policy in the Middle East. The minister alleges, for instance, that the Soviet Union is torpedoing all possibilities to reach a peaceful settlement in the region. What proof has Kamal Hasan 'Ali of his allegations which give rise only to misgivings" The Egyptian minister says that it is due to the actions of the Soviet Union and its allies in the Middle East that the doors to all the peaceful initiatives, beginning with Camp David and ending with the Reagan Plan, are regarded as closed.

Let us see what clearly emerges from the Egyptian minister's statement: He mentions peaceful initiatives, but only the American initiatives, utterly ignoring the resolutions of the Fes Summit and the Soviet plan for a Middle East settlement. Is it not clear whose interests concern Kamal Hasan 'Ali? These interests, of course, are not the interests of the victims of the Israeli aggression.

The other allegations made by the Egyptian minister are still further from the truth than his first allegations. The Egyptian minister has only one justification supporting his allegations, that is, that the Soviet forces in Afghanistan are only 400 km away from the Gulf. This is true. But does this indicate that the Soviet forces constitue a threat to the Arabs? If we are to believe the logic of Kamal Hasan 'Ali, it follows that only geographical proximity to the Soviet Union constitutes a threat to the Arabs. But what is the case with Finland, for instance? Finland has 1,000-km common border with the Soviet Union. It is noteworthy that it was only this week that the Soviet-Finnish treaty of friendship and cooperation, which was concluded in 1948, was renewed for a fresh period of 20 years before its expiration date.

Of course, the question is not one of distance, but of policy. The Soviet Union's policy is based on the principle of non-threat to anyone. Our country firmly and constantly supports the Arabs, and it enjoys, as we have already said, good relations with several Arab countries.

ALL-ARAB PEOPLE'S CONGRESS OPENS 9 JUNE

LD100116 Moscow TASS in English 2052 GMT 9 Jun 83

[Text] Damascus June 9 TASS -- The All-Arab People's Congress opened its emergency session here today. Taking part in its work are representatives of progressive parties and organisations from Arab countries, national liberation movements, and foreign guests. Muhammed Zuhayr Masariqah, deputy secretary-general of the regional leadership of the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party, speaking at the opening of the session, declared Syria's determination to follow its anti-imperialist course and oppose U.S. attempts to impose inequable capitulatory accords on Middle East peoples. Syria, he stressed, upholds the just national cause of Arabs and will not bow to military blackmail.

Masariqah pointed out that the conclusion by Lebanon of a fettering agreement with Israel was made at the expense of the national interests of Lebanon and the whole Arab nation. He stressed that Syria, linked with Lebanon by fraternal historical ties, will not allow the implementation of that capitulatory accord threatening its security.

Inaam Raad, chairman of Lebanon's National Social Party, speaking on behalf of the Lebanese National Patriotic Forces, pointed out that the agreement with Israel and the United States threatens to turn Lebanon into a staging area for American-Israeli hegemony in the Middle East. The Lebanese people, Inaam Raad stressed, are fully determined to uphold their independence and rid the country of Israeli aggressors. Resistance to the invaders will continue.

Talal Naji, deputy secretary-general of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (chief command) called on all those present to set up a broad Arab front comprising all units of the national liberation movement in the region. Unification of Arab patriots is necessary for thwarting the imperialist-Zionist offensive and changing the correlation of forces in the Middle East in favour of progress and national liberation. Preventing Washington and Tel Aviv [from] carrying out a new plot against Arab peoples is the task now on the agenda the Palestinian representative declared.

TUDEH CRACKDOWN IN IRAN BLAMED ON U.S.

GF121440 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1800 GMT 11 Jun 83

[Unattributed commentary: "The Anticommunist Uproar in Iran in the Style of the Other Side of the Ocean"]

[Text] Dear listeners: The arrest and savage crackdown on the Tudeh Party members, the active fighters against imperialism, that is continuing in Iran has greatly angered the people who cherish the struggle for freedom. Here a legal question arises: Who benefits from the crushing of Tudeh? As is known, this uproar first of all benefits those Iranian circles who want Iran to return to the failed policies of imperialist associates which the shah was pursuing. They are afraid of the future of good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union. These people have already welcomed President Reagan's call for a crusade against communism. They have also subjected those who struggled against the oppressive pro-U.S. Phalavi regime to strong propaganda and pressure. One must notice that the large pro-West bourgeoisie who in the past 2 years have established their holds in Iran and, similarly, the most reactionary clerical circles have also engaged in the savage propaganda against the Tudeh Party and fanning the fire of propaganda against the Soviet Union.

However, the catch is not this particular point. The Tudeh committee-in-exile in its statement has said: In Iran, with the cooperation and under the guidance of the CIA, the [British] intelligence service, Mossad, and the SAVAK experts, savage, insulting, and immoral methods are used against the arrested patriots. At this point one recalls that the imperialist agents in Indonesia, Chile, Bangladesh, and Thailand crushed the leftists forces with unprecedented savagery, and the revolutionaries and those fighting for freedom from imperialist monopolies were persecuted with unimaginable barbarity.

Now it has been proved that in all these places the CIA backed these crackdowns with the cooperation of the intelligence service and Mossad. Their officials guided the hands of the murderers and participated in the torture of the patriots. One day the details of the present imperialist plot against the Tudeh Party will come to light and the names of the persons who caused the arrests of the Tudeh members and tortured them will be revealed.

However, it is clear even now who organized and inspired this anticommunist and anti-Soviet movement in Iran. The plan for this provocative movement was gradually prepared by the present government of the United States. First, under secret orders, the U.S. propaganda organs ceased all mention of the subject of Iran. Later, the Washington officials began speaking friendly words regarding Iran and expressed the desire that Iran should restore the historical ties with them. They also expressed the willingness to allow U.S. supporters and workers to openly express their sentiments on the subject.

According to the signs in Iran and in the United States, in both countries certain persons believe that the time is ripe. It is known that officials of Iran have started secret talks with U.S. envoys regarding various levels. The Saudi weekly AL-MAJALLAH has reported that official Iranian agents have been meeting U.S. officials in Washington and in several Western capitals regarding a revival of relations between the two countries. The weekly says that the most recent Iranian official who secretly visited the United States was Ayatollah Yadollah Musavi Jazayeri. He met and held talks with certain U.S. officials He also discussed the present conditions in Iran and future of Iran. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, leaders of the seven capitalist countries attending the Williamsburg Summit expressed their readiness for cooperation with the rightist elements in Iran. The imperialist circles openly help the formation and organization of these rightist elements in Iran.

The American INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE said that the recent events in Iran dispelled the fear that the revolutionary measures would help the workers. Thousands of companies that have fallen into the hands of the government or the various revolutionary foundations will be restored to private ownership. The INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE further says that the action to calm the industrialists works side by side with enmity wit the Soviet Union. Activities are underway that aim to improve relations with the West. They are rejoicing on the other side of the ocean. They have succeeded in spreading anticommunist and anti-Soviet sentiment in Iran. At the same time foreign elements want to initiate a subversive movement against the Khomeyni regime. They want to replace the imperialist yoke on the Iranian people.

USSR SENDS GREETINGS TO 19TH OAU SESSION

PM101320 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 83 First Edition p 1

[Text] To the participants in the 19th session of the OAU member countries' Assembly of Heads of State and Government:

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers greet the participants in the 19th session of the OAU Assembly.

The Soviet Union, like everyone who cherishes the cause of peace and freedom, highly values the role of the OAU as a tried and proven instrument in the joint struggle of the countries and peoples of Africa against imperialism, colonialism, racism and apartheid; in defense of their lawful rights, for peace, and international security. Our country actively supports strengthening the OAU's prestige and effectiveness.

A position of direct opposition to the cohesion and unity of the African peoples is taken by those who are accustomed to thinking in terms of world domination and colonial plunder. They are exerting undisguised pressure on the African countries; they are blatantly interfering in their internal life; they are striving to disrupt the peace-loving and independent course of African and international affairs. It is their fault that tension is being increased in southern Africa, where Namibia, which is being illegally occupied by the South African racists, has turned into a base of aggression against neighboring states. They are trying to frighten the African Continent with military bases, and to draw it into their plans for global confrontation.

Previously there also fell to Africa's lot difficult times as a result of the treacherous imperialist policy of "divide and rule." Today it is being threatened by numerous traps set by the imperialists and neocolonialists. We wholly support the striving by African countries to defend their unity, to strengthen the prestige of the OAU, to raise its role not only in African affairs, but also on the international scene, despite the spirit of mistrust and division imported from the outside.

The pan-African forum has gathered at a time when, as a result of the increased activity of the militarist forces of imperialism, tension is increasing on our planet and the danger of nuclear war is growing. Today, as never before, it is essential to mobilize the efforts of all peoples in order to halt such a course of events. The Soviet Union is doing everything it can in order to ensure for mankind a reliable, peaceful future, and it will not stray from this course. The proposals of the Soviet Union to strengthen peace, slow down the dangerous arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, and to move toward genuine disarmament measures are well-known. We proceed from the premise that only a just peace, in which every state recognizes and respects the lawful rights and interests of other peoples, can be lasting.

A peaceful and independent Africa is an important factor of international stability. Our country is in favor of Africa being a continent of peace and good-neighborliness; it wants a successful solution to the important task of transforming Africa into a non-nuclea zone. True to the Leninist policy of peace and friendship between peoples, the Soviet Union declares its solidarity with the African peoples who are struggling against imperialist oppression, for a final elimination of the remnants of colonialism and racism on their continent, for national and social progress in conditions of peace and security.

We sincerely wish the African countries and peoples new achievements in building a free, peaceful and flourishing Africa, and also fruitful work and a successful conclusion of the 19th session of the assembly of heads of state and government of the OAU member countries.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers

PRAVDA HITS U.S. NICARAGUAN POLICY, ACTIVITIES

PM111745 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun First Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "End U.S. Tyranny in Central America"]

[Text] The situation in Central America continues to exacerbate. Nicaragua has become the main object of the reactionary forces' aggressive actions. The scale of the invasion of this country by counterrevolutionary Somoza bands is expanding and the campaign of slander and threats against the Sandinist people's revolution, which opened the path of independent development before Nicaragua, is intensifying.

It is no secret to anybody that the Reagan administration is organizing this undeclared war against Nicaragua. It is well known that it is the United States that put the tyrannical Somoza dynasty in power and supported it for many decades, and that the name of Sandino itself, which has become a symbol of the struggle against Washington's armed brigandage in Central America, is hateful to U.S. imperialism. The use for aggression against Nicaragua of Somoza mercenaries operating from the territory of neighboring states cannot mislead one as to who is, in reality, directing the intervention.

This is openly stated by political and public figures in the United States. The U.S. press writes about this, stating, for example, that back in 1981 the CIA began creating, from among Latin Americans, special forces "to strike at objects in Nicaragua" and that to date these forces have incrased to 7,000.

The recent revelations by the U.S. President, who considers that he has the right to dispute the legality of the Nicaraguan Government which enjoys the complete support of its people and extensive international recognition, are an example of cynical disregard for the generally accepted norms of relations between states. What is the value of the White House's complaints about the Congress placing obstacles in the way of supporting the Somozists and the direct demands for open financing of the operations of mercenaries and terrorists whom Washington calls..."freedom fighters"?

Against this background the essence of the events around Nicaragua must be clear even to those who do not wish to believe the obvious. It is a question of escalation of aggression, of attempts to overthrow a government that does not suit Washington, in a small Central American country whose people has decided to determine its own destiny. It is calculated that if the Somoza mercenaries do not succeed in achieving military successes, their actions may destabilize the situation in Nicaragua, create a situation of uncertainty, and disorganize the economy. The same aims are served, too, by the use of economic "sanctions," expressed in the fact that the U.S. Government has cut by 90 percent the quota of Nicaraguan sugar imports.

Thus the White House is trying to assume, no more and no less, the "right" to determine the system that Nicaragua and other Central American and Caribbean states should have, and that political course they should pursue.

In order to justify these claims, a racket has been unleashed about some kind of threat to U.S. security allegedly represented by the states of the region that have chosen the path of free, independent development. Central America and the Caribbean Basin are arbitrarily declared the "third" and the "fourth border of the United States."

To further its hegemonistic policy the Reagan administration is stubbornly fanning the myth of "the threat of communism," and tries to explain the liberation movement in Central American countries and its socioeconomic causes as being due to "the intrigues and subversive activities" of the Soviet Union and Cuba.

However, the falsity of these fabrications is so evident that even realistically thinking representatives of U.S. political circles, who it is impossible to suspect of being sympathetic to the USSR and socialist Cuba, refute them. Thus Senator Dodd, in reply on behalf of congressmen and members of the Democratic Party to Reagan's speech of 27 April 1983, stated: "Dictatorships and military regimes have strangled democracy and crushed human rights in Central America. If poverty, hunger, and injustice did not reign here, there would be no revolutions. Until this system of oppression disappears, the region will engender revolutions...."

Washington's organization of intervention against Nicaragua arouses indignation and concern among the world public. The escalation of aggression carries a risk to peace in the whole of this region and is a new and dangerous factor exacerbating the international situation as a whole. This U.S. policy in Central America was condemned at the UN Security Council session, in the political declaration of the Seventh Conference of Heads of States and Governments of the Nonaligned Countries in New Delhi, and at the recent Socialist International congress. This intervention against Nicaragua seriously worries the Latin American states, many of whom have already directly experienced the habits of their "North American neighbor." An expression of this concern is the activity of such countries as Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, and Panama which come out for the peoples' self-determination, noninterference in the internal affairs of Central American states, and for a peaceful political settlement of disputes in the region by means of equal dialogue between the interested sides. It is by no means fortuitous that the United States is sabotaging the efforts to normalize the situation being undertaken by these countries, is refusing a direct dialogue with Nicaragua, and is at the same time hampering talks between Honduras and Nicaragua.

The Nicaraguan people are giving a decisive rebuff to the armed intervention. The Nicaraguan Government insists that the principles of the UN Charter, banning intervention in states' internal affairs, the use of force in international relations, and envisaging a peaceful settlement of disputes between states, should be observed. Nicaragua demands the withdrawal of the Somoza bands that have invaded Nicaragua, the cessation of armed attacks from Honduras being organized by the United States, the departure of U.S. Navy vessels from Nicaragua's littoral waters, the cessation of flights by U.S. espionage planes over its territory, and of the subversive activities by the U.S. special services in financing and arming forces hostile to the Sandinist revolution. In many countries people of diverse views and convictions are expressing their support for the Nicaraguan people's just struggle. They state loudly: "Hands off Nicaragua!"

The Soviet people are in solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Nicaragua and other Latin American countries who are defending their right to decide their own destinies. They resolutely demand the cessation of the armed invasion of Nicaragua and the immediate end of the provocations and threats with regard to sovereign states. The strengthening of peace and security in Central America, as in any other part of the world, is possible only on the basis of respect for each people's right to choose its own way of life. Attempts to subject the countries of this region to great power arbitrariness and to plant or perpetuate despotic anti-people regimes obedient to Washington are doomed to inevitable failure.

MEXICAN SOCIALIST LEADER WRITES IN PRAVDA

PM101627 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 83 Second Edition p 4

[Article by Eduardo Montes, member of the Political Commission of the United Socialist Party of Mexico Central Committee: "Under the Banner of Unity and Struggle"]

[Text] The United Socialist Party of Mexico (PSUM) has been in existence for less than 2 years. It emerged as a result of the amalgamation of various polical organizations occupying Marxist-Leninist positions, apart from the Mexican People's Party, the

Socialist Action and Unity Movement, the Revolutionary Socialist Party, and the United Popular Action Movement.

A few years ago now the communists realized the importance of forming a bloc of leftwing forces, not simply for the sake of increasing their weight in the country's political arena, but with a view to achieving close unity as one party which could fight for the socialist transformation of Mexico. Concrete steps in this direction were taken at the end of 1976. At that time talks were held between representatives of the various political groups and a principled basis for their unification was worked out. Other political groups, apart from the parties which subsequently joined the new alliance, also took part in the talks. However, in the first months of 1977, the government announced a legislative reform which opened the doors to official recognition for many leftwing parties. In this connection almost all the participants in the talks tried to gain legalization independently. All this naturally delayed the process of unification.

The need to create an alliance of leftwing forces still continued to exist. And it was dictated by history itself. The PCM was formed in 1919 under the influence of the victory of the revolutionary proletariat in Russia and the inspiring influence of the Communist International. For almost 25 years the party of communists remained the only Marxist-Leninist organization in the country. The first generations of communists made great efforts to entice the most advanced detachments of the working class with its program guidelines on the building of socialism and communism. Beginning in first days, they showed themselves to be consistent internationalists and supporters of the world's first socialist state. But in a country where the peasantry was predominant and where there was an extremely weak proletariat and a very powerful ruling regime which had arisen as a result of the victory of the bourgeois revolution in 1917, the struggle was extremely complex for the communists. To this must be added the poor theoretical equipment of the Communist Party, which prevented the formulation from Marxist positions of political guidelines that would have ensured it success in extending its influence.

From the 1940's onwards, other political organizations with a socialist tendency began to form in Mexico. They announced their allegiance to Marxism-Leninism and their support, first for the Soviet Union, and then for the socialist states formed following World War II. Separate organizations appeared as a result of splits in the PCM, which at that time was undergoing a prolonged period of internal difficulties. A number of groups formed independently. Many of them did not exist for long, while others had a more prolonged life. This dissipation of political forces was seen by the communists as a serious problem, as an obstacle for the party in its transformation into an influential organization possessing the potential to struggle for power.

This diversity often not only resulted in disputes between parties which were politically and ideologically related, but also produced confusion among the broad masses of working people. It was possible to overcome the fragmentation and create the conditions for fashioning a united party only by achieving political maturity and the joint activity of the various groups. This was understood sufficiently clearly by those parties which were striving for unity back in the mid-1970's. Though at that time their efforts did not produce any positive results, they did help to create a basis for fashioning a leftwing coalition at the beginning of 1979.

This coalition, led by the Communist Party, attained legalization and took part in federal elections. Taking part in them for the first time, the PCM became the third political force in the country. Representatives of various parties included on the Communist Party's electoral lists were elected. A parliamentary communist group of the leftwing coalition was formed, which operated successfully in the Chamber of Deputies. These first joint steps assisted the organizational amalgamation of the left-wing forces in 1981.

The PCM bore a special responsibility in the process of unification. For the PCM this meant ending a 62-year period of independent existence and merging into the new party. The communists could only agree to this on condition that the formation of the new political organization guaranteed the continuation of the PCM's course. From the moment that the unification movement resumed, practically everybody agreed that the organization's theoretical foundation should be the teaching on scientific socialism founded by Marx and Engels and developed by Lenin, and that the chief principles of its activity should be democratic centralism, proletarian internationalism, and a precisely defined line toward the development of fraternal relations with all the world's communist and workers parties. The PSUM chose the Internationale as its anthem and the hammer and sickle as its symbol.

And these principles were the basis for the formation of the PSUM in 1981. The founding assembly unanimously approved the program, principles and rules of the party, which creatively generalized the experience of Mexico's communists and socialists, and also of the international communist and workers movement.

The program sets democracy and socialism as its aims and proposes a path of struggle for economic, political and social transformations which will make it possible not merely to resolve the problems which are currently tormenting the people's masses in Mexico, but will also open up for the working class the prospect of becoming the hegemonic force in the revolutionary process.

In the first year of its existence, the PSUM successfully endured a number of tests. Literally the day after its formation, the party joined in the complex campaign for the country's presidential and parliamentary elections. Despite the fact that the PSUM had only just begun its activity, it showed its ability to wage the struggle. Arnoldo Martinez Verdugo, who for almost 20 years had been general secretary of the PCM Central Committee, was put forward as the party's presidential candidate. The party conducted its propaganda campaign successfully and in the 4 July elections received 1 million votes, coming third in the voting. Thus, in the eyes of Mexican public opinion, the PSUM was transformed into an important opposition force.

Having completed the election campaign, the PSUM put forward its proposals for resolving the severe economic crisis being experienced by the country. It is attempting to create a broad democratic movement in the search for a way out. The party supported the government's decree on the nationalization of the banks and the introduction of controls on currency transactions, since these steps are also envisaged in its programs. At the same time, the PSUM is carrying out political and organizational work among the working class and all the working people's masses, trying to enlist their support for its programs. Alongside its vigorous political activity, the PSUM has at the same time been carrying out purposeful work to rally its ranks, striving to achieve the complete unification and genuine amalgamation of the parties belonging to it, which are different in their origins, history, and style of work. There is no doubt that this process, as was expected, has not proceeded without difficulties.

We believe that the creation of the PSUM is a special instance of the unification of revolutionary forces. Unlike earlier analogous unions of Marxist parties in other countries formed at the culminating moments of political development or in periods of crisis, the PSUM emerged at a time of relative political calm in the country. The formation and development of the PSUM is a contribution to the struggle against the fragmentation of Marxist-Leninist forces in Mexico. It is a search for ways to achieve the aims of socialism and communism, a search characteristic of the international communist movement.

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE POLITBURO SESSION HELD

LD101534 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 10 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS -- The Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee has reviewed at its regular meeting the results of the Soviet-Finnish talks which took place in Moscow during the official visit of Mauno Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic. It was noted with satisfaction that the visit had been highlighted by the further extension of relations of friendship and goodneighbourliness between the USSR and Finland. Having approved the talks which had been held, the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee emphasized that their results and the documents signed during the talks marked a new major step in the consistent development of comprehensive cooperation between the USSR and the Finnish Republic and were making a useful contribution towards stronger peace and security in Europe.

The Politbureau heard information about the conversation Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had had with the notable political and public figures, Averill and Pamela Harriman. The Politbureau supports in full the evaluation of the state of Soviet-American relations given by Yuriy Andropov during the conversation and believes that a course of peaceful coexistence and the development of mutually beneficial relations with the United States of America on the basis of equality remains the general line of Soviet policy. This approach is hampered by the policy of the incumbent U.S. Administration aimed at reaching military superiority over the Soviet Union and dictating its own terms to it. This policy, negating everything positive that has been achieved in relations between the USSR and the USA, is futile both at present and in the longer term.

The Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee has reviewed the progress of the public discussion of the draft law of the USSR on work collectives and on enhancing their role in running enterprises, institutions, and organizations. It was pointed out at the meeting that the draft of that major legislative act had evoked a far-ranging response from the working people in their statements, at meetings, in the press and on radio and television. All in all, more than 1.2 million meetings of working people with a total attendance of more than 110 million have taken place all over the country. Many letters related to the draft law have come to the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and the editorial offices of newspapers and journals.

The discussion shows that the Soviet people are responding to the draft law as to another manifestation of the care taken by the Communist Party and the Soviet State to develop socialist democracy and to enhance production and socio-political activity of citizens with a view to the successful fulfilment of state plans, the strengthening of the economic and defence might of the country and the further improvement of the people's well-being.

Many proposals and remarks have been made on the draft law at meetings of the working people and also in letters of citizens. They are being thoroughly studied by the commissions of legislative proposals of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee noted the exceptional importance of the careful examination and consideration of proposals made by working people in finalizing the draft and in the practical activities of all the party, government and public organizations in the centre and in places. It was found useful to submit the draft law, corrected with due account for the results of its discussion by the public, to the next regular session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee approved the proposals prepared by the Council of Ministers of the USSR on the construction and putting into operation of atomic heat supply stations in 1983-1990.

The development of such stations will make it possible better to use nuclear fuel to improve heat supply to major cities and become a major component of the fulfilment of the long-term energy programme of the USSR.

The Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee heard Andrey Gromyko's account of the results of his conversations with Fernando Moran, minister of foreign affairs of Spain, and Mikhail Gorbachev's account of the results of the visit by a delegation of the USSR Sumpere Soviet to Canada.

The meeting of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee also examined other questions of the development of the national economy, the party's development, and the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

ABRASIMOV TO HEAD NEW TOURIST COMMITTEE

Recalled From GDR

LD111646 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 11 Jun 83

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has transformed the USSR Council of Ministers Main Administration for Foreign Toruism into the USSR State Committee for Foreign Tourism. Petr Andreyevich Abrasimov has been appointed chairman of the committee; he has been released from the post of USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the GDR.

Comrade Abrasimov was born 16 May, 1912 in Belorussia; received higher education; and took part in the Great Patriotic War. From 1948-1956 he was first deputy chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers and secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee. From 1956 he was involved in diplomatic work and was USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary in Poland, the GDR, and the Republic of France. From 1973-75 he headed a CPSU Central Committee department, and from 1975 was USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the GDR and member of the CPSU Central Committee. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Vyacheslav Ivanovich Kochemasov as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the GDR.

New Envoy Appointed

LD120055 Moscow TASS in English 2036 GMT 12 Jun 83

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS -- Vyacheslav Kochemasov has been appointed ambassador of the USSR to the GDR. Petr Abrasimov who earlier held the post has been transferred to another job.

Kochemasov was born in 1918. In 1942-1955 he was on Komsomol work. From 1949 to 1955 he was secretary of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League (Komsomol) of the Soviet Union. After that he was in the diplomatic service: a counsellor, minister counsellor of the USSR Embassy to the GDR, deputy head of the Third European Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1961-1962 he worked as deputy and first deputy chairman of the State Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries. Since 1962 he has been deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS USSR AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY

PM101342 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 83 Morning Edition p 2

[O. Pavlov "Agricultural Review": "The Farmers Are Greeting the Summer"]

[Text] According to USSR Central Statistical Administration data, spring crops had been sown on 130.3 million hectares in the country, including 79.4 million hectares of grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) by Monday, 30 May. Grain corn occupied 4.6 million and soya 541.000 hectares. Rice occupied 620,000 hectares.

Millet had been sown on 2.4 million and buckwheat on 1.1 million hectares.

Feed crops have been sown on 28.4 million hectares. Silage corn occupied 13.3 million hectares.

Potatoes had been planted on 3 million hectares.

On the threshold of summer, sowing is drawing to a close -- as it should be. To be sure some sowing work still remain and it demands the closest attention, since the optimum times specified by agricultural specialists are receding. Around 40 percent of soya and more than 30 percent of buckwheat still remain to be sown. Dagestan rice-growers continue to lag behind. There are delays in the planting of potatoes in Altay Kray, Kemerovo and Irkutsk Oblasts and -- strange to say -- in Rostov Oblast.

The spring crop sowing rate this week was slightly down compared to last week's on the whole: 17.8 against 20.7 million hectares. That is understandable! Sowing units are leaving the fields on the country's European territory. Farmers in the east, on the other hand, were working energetically.

In one week, out of the 13.2 million hectares of graincrops sown in the country as a whole, 6.5 million hectares were sown in Kazakhstan. The rate was very high in Kustanay Oblast (1.7 million hectares), and the Turkay and Kokchetav Oblasts (1.1 million hectares each). In the Russian Federation more grain crops than elsewhere have been sown on farms in the Altay Kray -- 920,000 hectares, in Omsk Oblast -- 840, 000 hectares, and in Novosibirsk Oblast -- 640,000 hectares.

Reports coming in from the local level speak of serious demands being made this year on the quality of sowing, too. So on most farms in Kustanay Oblast efficient agronomic monitoring has been organized, in the course of which flaws were detected on the sovkhozes named for Frunze and for Altynsarin Kamyshninskiy, and on the Voronezhskiy Sovkhoz in Fedorovskiy Rayon.

On Marinovskiy Sovkhoz in Tselinograd Oblast's Atbasarskiy Rayon, people's control officials noted the stoppages of machinery on a massive scale. The 1st and 3d teams were sowing untreated seeds and were not applying fertilizers to the drills, although they were available. On that farm they would seem to have grown accustomed to the fact that their neighbors make up for their shortfalls in sowing and threshing. So, for the umpteenth year machine operators from the Samarskiy sovkhoz can be observed working on the 1st team's fields. Mutual assistance is a good thing, of course. However, the need for it arises not because there is a shortage of people and machinery on the Marinovskiy Sovkhoz, but because of pure and simple mismanagement.

Prompt steps by rayon agro-industrial associations have made it possible to eliminate many of the shortcomings noted.

Nevertheless, this must be a lesson to farm leaders and specialists -- after all, ahead lies the tending of sowings, the struggle against weeds and feed procurement, and these jobs must be carried out faultlessly.

The sowing of graincrops has been carried out well by farmers in Omsk Oblast. Progressive agricultural techniques are widely used there. Large areas have been allocated to the intensive wheat strain "Omskaya-9". It has been sown within the optimum deadlines despite a sudden cold snap and rains. Considerable areas of graincrops have been sown on clean fallow, as a second crop after fallow or after the other most suitable previous crops. The soil has been well prepared (taking into account zonal farming systems), and fertilizer has been applied during the sowing on a bigger scale than previously.

The sowing of the main cash crop -- wheat -- has been practically completed on farms in Kustanay, Kokchetav, North Kazakhstan, Pavlodar, Turgay, Chita, Kurgan, Chelyabinsk, Omsk and Tyumen Oblasts and in the Tuva ASSR.

Farms in all union republics are continuing their feed procurement. The first mowing has been completed in Kharkov Oblast. The area of perennial grasses this year exceeds 500,000 hectares. Never before has so much land been allocated to grass in the Kharkov region. Leading farms have obtained up to 190 quintals of alfafa green matter per hectare. On rayon agro-industrial association council recommendations, mobile laboratories for ascertaining the protein content of grasses have been set up on kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It is envisaged to obtain two more good mowings of perennial grasses in the oblast. It is planned to procure half a million tons of feed units more than last year for the coming wintering period.

Farms in Belorussia acquired 10,000 new machines this year for the procurement of feed, including high-speed mowers, pickup balers and self-propelled feed harvesting combines. Rayon agro-industrial association councils in a number of rayons on vast expanses of reclaimed land in the floodlands of the rivers Dnepr, Pripyat and Sozh have pooled high-capacity machinery in interfarm detachments. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes intend to manage the first mowing of grass on an area in excess of 2 million hectares in 2 weeks and later to obtain a good aftercrop.

Haymaking is gathering momentum. Grasses have already been gathered from 5.5 million hectares in the country: 2.4 million metric tons of hay, 5.6 million metric tons of haylage, and 478,000 metric tons of grass meal have been procured. The sowing of sunflowers has been completed and the planting of vegetables is drawing to a close. In short, farmers are moving on to summer tasks.

Incidentally, quite a few "summer" jobs have already been carried out. So vegetables have been irrigated once on 1.5 million hectares, twice on 296,000 hectares and three times on 191,000 hectares. All this is considerably more than by the same date last year. This means that the harvest of a whole series of vegetable crops will reach the consumer somewhat earlier this year.

Tending of sugar beet is in full swing. On 85 percent of fields the plants have been thinned out. Cotton seedlings have been intertilled 1.5 times on average. They are being irrigated and topdressed with mineral fertilizer.

At the same time the harvest of winter barley is continuing in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Turkmenia. The picking of high-quality tea is underway.

The farmers are looking to the summer. Much work lies ahead. But perhaps the most important at the moment is the procurement of feed. Mass haymaking is imminent on the expanses of Russia, and in Belorussia and the Baltics. And it is necessary to prepare well for it, devoting special attention to the natural grasslands.

MARSHAL KULIKOV ON END OF SOYUZ-83 EXERCISES

LD120042 Potsdam Radio Volga in Russian to the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany 1830 GMT 11 Jun 83

[Text] On completion of the Soyuz-83 exercises our correspondent asked Marshal of the Soviet Union Viktor Georgiyevich Kulikov, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of Warsaw Pact Nations, to comment upon this event.

[Begin Kulikov recording] The Soyuz-83 joint exercises have just ended. The exercises represented a coalition as far as composition is concerned but were united in their spirit and way of thinking. The servicemen acted in a friendly way and like a united militant family. The exercises passed in an organized and instructive way. Increased coordination in carrying out different plan tasks, and precise interaction, firmness and continuity in leadership on the part of the commanders and staff at all levels was displayed during the exercises. The main conclusion that can be drawn from the joint exercises that have been held is that the servicemen of the allied armies have shown a high level of political maturity, readiness and ability to defend their socialist fatherland.

Genuine socialist internationalism, the inviolable moral and political unity of the fraternal peoples of the Warsaw Pact countries and the militant comity of their armies are clearly displayed in all of this. Our peoples have to build socialism and communism in a difficult military and political situation. Lastly, it has become much more acute. The situation in the Near East remains tense and explosive. Provocations against Syria, Angola and Mozambique are being intensified.

The United States has embarked upon the path of support for intervention in the countries of Central America. They have broken off and presently are avoiding resumption of talks on the limitation of strategic weapons, on the reduction of armed forces in Europe and on the total and general banning of nuclear weapons tests. They are working out new nuclear first-strike systems, are planning the use of chemical weapons and are militarizing space [passage indistinct], medium-range have entered a blind alley. Besides this, we cannot fail to take into account the pro-American line on these questions of the FRG Government and the changes in the military policy of France which are making the tension in Europe more acute.

Under present-day conditions, the threat of aggression, the threat of war from imperialism, is a stern reality of our time. It demands from us redoubled and tripled vigilance and tireless work in raising combat readiness in every unit and detachment.

As we work at the further improvement of our military skill, we must constantly strengthen the combat and class alliance and always remember the slogan we have in common: Brothers in class and brothers in arms are invincible in unity. This slogan must become our norm for our entire life, for our entire army activity.

I wish all servicemen great successes in conquering new heights of military skill in the name of raising the combat readiness and military might of the Joint Armed Forces. [end recording]